

The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXX

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1925

No. 3126

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS	613
EDITORIALS:	
New Wars and Old Debts.....	616
News from the Hub.....	617
The Norton Professorship.....	617
Our Changing Army.....	618
THE A B C OF RELATIVITY:	
I. Why Clocks and Foot-Rules Mislead. By Bertrand Russell.....	619
BAD PEANUTS AND BIG BUSINESS. By Robert Hammond Murray..	620
RACE PRIDE AND RACE PREJUDICE. By Herbert Adolphus Miller..	622
CLASS JUSTICE IN GERMANY. By Louis Fischer.....	624
TOO MANY COLLEGE GIRLS?	
II. Examinations and Other Tests. By Freda Kirchwey.....	625
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter.....	627
CORRESPONDENCE	628
BOOKS, MUSIC, AND PLAYS:	
Out of Singing Days. By Clement Wood.....	630
The First of Tragic Poets. By Lane Cooper.....	630
The Stream of Consciousness. By Joseph Wood Krutch.....	631
Beyond Patriotism. By Kirby Page.....	632
Talkers. By Mary Ross.....	633
New Women for Old. By Malcolm M. Willey.....	633
Nitti in Switzerland. By Frederick Bausman.....	633
Books in Brief.....	634
Music: Swedish Impressions. By Henrietta Straus.....	635
Drama: Galsworthy Escapes Drama. By Joseph Wood Krutch.....	635
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:	
The Last Statement of Patriarch Tikhon.....	637
Insuring Old Age in England.....	638

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LEWIS S. GANNETT

ARTHUR WARNER

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

MANAGING EDITOR

LITERARY EDITOR

FREDA KIRCHWEY

MARK VAN DOREN

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN A. HOBSON

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

H. L. MENCKEN

NORMAN THOMAS

CARL VAN DOREN

DAVID BOEHM, ADVERTISING MANAGER

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, \$5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, \$6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 38 So. Dearborn Street. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: E. Thurtle, M.P., 36, Temple Fortune Hill, N.W. 11, England.

THE SUPREME COURT could not have done otherwise than uphold the right of the press to publish income-tax figures, without violating the Constitution or admitting itself unable to construe plain English. We do not agree with the opinion that the law was ambiguous. The trouble was that the Treasury Department was opposed to the publicity provision and set out to sabotage instead of enforce it. Justice Sutherland understates the case when he says in writing the opinion in which the rest of the court concurs:

Information which everybody is at liberty to acquire and the acquisition of which Congress seemed especially desirous of facilitating, in the absence of some clear and positive provision to the contrary, cannot be regarded otherwise than as public property, to be passed on to others as freely as the possessors of it.

Congress could not prevent the newspapers from passing on "information which everybody is at liberty to acquire" even by inserting "some clear and positive provision to the contrary," for such a limitation would obviously violate the First Amendment to the Constitution, which says: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." The press has a clear constitutional right to print any public information, document, or record, and should permit neither Congress nor any executive officer to curtail that right.

TWO VACANCIES in the United States Tariff Commission are about to be filled by President Coolidge. They were caused by the appointment of Vice-Chairman William S. Culbertson as minister to Rumania and the more recent resignation of William Burgess. Both are Republicans. Under the act creating the body, non-partisanship was to be assured by the requirement that not more than three of the commissioners were to be members of the same political party; but it was a singular fact that before the vacancies occurred there were four Republican members: Chairman Thomas C. Marvin, Edward P. Costigan, and the two whose posts are now unoccupied. The only Democrats are Henry H. Glassie and Alfred P. Dennis. That four were Republicans presumably was due to the rating of Mr. Costigan, when President Wilson appointed him in 1917, as a Progressive. But before helping found the Progressive Party in Colorado Mr. Costigan had run for office on the Republican ticket, and he is now a Republican. It will be clearly illegal, therefore, if Mr. Coolidge attempts to appoint Republicans to both the existing vacancies. The Senate must pass on his selections, and it is reasonable to assume that even within the Republican ranks there will be decisive opposition if any effort is made to thwart the law.

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE served twelve years in the Senate. Since his retirement therefrom he has immersed himself in historical studies which have presumably helped him to view dispassionately the activities of the legislative body in which he served. At any rate he has just made an address at West Baden, Indiana, before the members of the Inland Daily Press Association in which he has come out unqualifiedly in defense of the rules of the Senate and in opposition to the proposed Dawes "reform." "The drive now under way to wreck one of the oldest, most valuable, and most distinctive of American institutions, free speech in the Senate, the only place in the whole world where free speech still survives," he declares, "goes to the heart of our American form of government." His reasons for opposing the change which he asserts is nothing less than a revolution in our government are, first, that majority cloture in the Senate will produce more laws, "hasty laws, immature laws, passionate laws, sometimes, perhaps, corrupt laws"; second, that no good bill or worthy project has ever been killed, or endangered, by unlimited debate; third, the more leisurely legislation of the Senate often permits the rallying of public sentiment against unwise or merely partisan legislation passed by the House of Representatives; fourth, while this would work well for conservatives when in a majority it would be their undoing if radicals controlled. Finally Mr. Beveridge correctly denies that it is true that one man can or ever has blocked legislation in the Senate, and then pays his respects to Mr. Dawes thus:

It may not be offensive to point out that constitutional interpretation by a rising vote of a town meeting after an impassioned appeal on only one side of a question is not the most sensible or trustworthy way of deciding what the Constitution means. Yet this was done not very long ago by the chief protagonist of this agitation—and done in Boston.

A CONFERENCE has just been held in London between representatives of British and Russian labor unions with a view to achieving international labor-union unity. An Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Council has been appointed to promote cooperation between the two movements and the British section will try to induce the International Federation of Trade Unions (the Amsterdam International) to agree to "a free, unconditional, and immediate conference with representatives of the Russian trade-union movement." In case Amsterdam refuses, the British unions will call an international conference independently. The conservative press in England sees in these proposals an important swing toward bolshevism in the post-war quarrel between the Amsterdam and the Red International. Certainly the numbers represented by the two labor-union movements will not tend to reassure the conservative. British unions are credited with 5,000,000 members and the Russian with 6,000,000; the membership of the unions affiliated with the Amsterdam International is 16,500,000 (of these the British number fewer than 4,400,000). The Labor press seems to believe that a frank discussion will bring the two points of view together. Difficult as it appears for the moderate socialist of Amsterdam to join the "united front" of the Communists, or for the Red International to stomach the mild methods of Amsterdam, any attempt at an understanding is to be applauded.

PRESIDENT HINDENBURG has blown hot and cold in his brief period of office-holding, as was to have been expected. If he seemed embarrassed and ill at ease and stumbled frequently in reading his inaugural speech, there was no doubt of his good faith when he promised to uphold the constitution and there can be none that he will continue to live up to his oath. But his course must be one of compromise. There are reliable observers in Berlin who feel that it will be easier for the Government under Hindenburg to carry on the Dawes Plan and move in the direction of the League of Nations than would have been the case had Marx been chosen. Meanwhile, the Chancellor is going on with his high-protective-tariff proposals, which include duties on foodstuffs in the interests of the Agrarians, that is, the Right, thus furnishing additional proof that one more statesman knows nothing about history or how food tariffs have worked either in his own country or in England. As for Herr Scheidemann's snarling on foreign policy, the Berlin correspondents are right in saying that when the Allies again formulate their policies the Germans will once more sign on the dotted line, even though Hindenburg, the fighter, is in the Wilhelmstrasse. But the Allies are doing a grievous wrong to themselves and to Germany in delaying to come to an agreement among themselves. From one of the most internationally minded and trustworthy observers in Berlin comes to us this note:

If things are left to drift by the fault of the Allies, there may be difficulties which will permit the Right to go into opposition again; and then nobody knows what may happen. Practically, therefore, I think it is of the utmost importance that matters should be hastened; the disarmament question, the evacuation of Cologne, the security pact, the control of the armaments of Germany by the League of Nations, and the entry of Germany into the League must be settled this summer before other developments can complicate the situation. It is extremely important that this should be realized by all parties.

THE DEATH OF LORD FRENCH, the Earl of Ypres, is a fresh reminder that since many of the chief actors in the drama of 1914-1918 were men well along in years they will pass rapidly from the scene. General French had earned an enviable reputation for himself in the Boer War as a cavalry leader, and it was frequently said of him that he was the only English officer who knew how to meet the Boers at their own game. As commander of the superb expeditionary force which was so hastily thrown into Belgium in the first days of the war, he fought with magnificent courage and determination. There can never be a more moving or thrilling story of military heroism than that of this British force in the retreat through Belgium and into France, for surely no men ever took terrible punishment more gallantly. The Germans were so sure on one occasion that they had captured the little army that they issued a bulletin saying that they would bag the British force in a few hours. They reckoned without Sir John French. We are aware, of course, that he was much criticized for the terrible losses of his men, and military historians will dispute throughout the ages whether the responsibility for the lack of munitions and supplies rested mostly upon him or upon the War Office. Again, General French could not get on with Kitchener and other superiors, and so his supersession became inevitable. He was much better fitted for handling 150,000 men than the vast army which came later to be commanded by General Haig. But history will surely always bear testimony to the gallantry and the dogged determination of the Earl of Ypres.

IT IS ALWAYS ENCOURAGING to discover people who refuse to be paupers even when somebody obligingly offers to pauperize them. Most of our "captains of industry" are ready and eager to be paupers. They cry for a tariff on their manufactures, maintaining unblushingly that unless their industry is artificially supported it cannot stand on its feet. Some of our workingmen have been all too ready to champion this pauperization in the hope to benefit by it, but we are glad to see that American seamen are not among them. The proposal of T. V. O'Connor, chairman of the United States Shipping Board, that the nation pay a direct subsidy to compensate shipping companies for higher wages to native seamen has met with spirited opposition from Andrew Furuseth, president of the International Seamen's Union of America, who says the members of his organization do not want "something for nothing." It does cost more to operate American than foreign ships, he admits, but this is not primarily due to the wages paid. British and Norwegian ships pay almost as much, and although Japanese wages are lower the saving is offset by the need of carrying a 50 per cent larger crew. The greater cost of operating American ships, Mr. Furuseth argues, is due to the incompetence of our officers and crews, necessitating expensive repairs in ports which on foreign vessels are done at sea. We allow men to become officers with too little training and leave the selection of our crews to shipping officers ashore instead of to the heads of departments on board ship.

A GREAT OPPORTUNITY has come to Glenn Frank, editor of the *Century*. At thirty-eight years of age he has been elected president of the University of Wisconsin. For years that institution ranked as perhaps the foremost, and certainly the most progressive, of the Western

State universities; then it fell upon evil times. At one time muck-raked by the Wisconsin Legislature because of the charge that it was "too radical," the passing of the years found its so-called radical professors caught up with and passed by the march of events or toned down by the conservatism of age. Instead of standing as a tower of freedom and free speech when the war-mania came on, Madison went with all the rest in mad imitation of the German, French, and English professors who threw away all ethical standards, all scientific detachment, all desire for truth in their efforts to be at the head of the nationalistic stampede. The university at Madison has been, scholastically speaking, merely marking time for the last few years. It has been held together, but there has been no leadership and no advance. Meanwhile, the problems of administration and of undergraduate control have grown more serious, the question of finance is more pressing, and, as in so many other State universities, politics has been a disturbing factor, or rather is still a force to be reckoned with; the entire battle between the old "Stalwart" Republicans and the Progressives headed by Robert M. La Follette has had its repercussions within the university walls.

GLENN FRANK, whose ability as a liberal writer and speaker has won him a national reputation, will bring to his task at Madison four years of experience as assistant to the president of Northwestern University, where his record as an undergraduate was considered phenomenal. More important than that is the fact that he has expressed his earnest belief in the necessity of the closest cooperation between the State and its university. Editorially and on the platform he has shown an understanding of the difficulties which arise out of this relationship—the fear of the expert; the danger of the majority's tyrannizing over minority opinion; the menace of a purely political control; the conflict between the scientific and the political mind. He sees clearly how easily a State university could degenerate into a "reptile university" to serve current political ends, as Bismarck's "reptile press" served the political ends of the German Empire. It is a problem to try a giant and to it Mr. Frank will take unusual tact, skill in analysis, eloquence, and understanding. We wish him all possible success and shall follow his course with profound interest as one of the vital college experiments now going on. If he succeeds in making Wisconsin free, the resort of brilliant young scholars guaranteed their intellectual integrity and freedom from the blight of our horrible American conformity and mental strait-jacketing, he will perform a tremendous service to the entire country.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN is to have another fling. The conflict between fundamentalism and evolution will not be settled, of course, by the court proceedings in Tennessee any more than it was by the debates in England fifty years ago. In the exchange of oratory we can hope for no more than that a few fundamentalists will learn something about Darwin's theory. So far the contest is mild compared with the bitter invective used by Huxley against the enemies of Darwin when the "Origin of Species" was first published. Darwin himself seldom answered attacks, but Monckton Milnes relates that at a meeting of the British Association, when Huxley remarked that the blood of guinea pigs congealed in rhombohedrons, Wilberforce sprang to his feet and declared "such notions lead directly

to atheism." After all it is neither the theory of evolution nor rhombohedrons, but the scientific method, which is dangerous to the Bryans of the world, and it is too late to stop that even though the legislatures of the forty-eight States prohibit the teaching of Darwin. Huxley remarked that

the leading characteristic of the nineteenth century has been the rapid growth of the scientific spirit, the consequent application of scientific methods of investigation to all the problems with which the human mind is occupied, and the correlative rejection of traditional beliefs which have proved their incompetence to bear such investigation.

JUDGE BAKER of the United States District Court in Wheeling, West Virginia, refused on May 9 to punish peaceful persuasion to join the United Mine Workers as a contempt of an injunction obtained by the West Virginia-Pittsburgh Coal Company. The reason was that the injunction in question, through an inadvertence, omitted to forbid peaceful persuasion to organize. It might have done so. In the Hitchman case the Supreme Court reinstated such an injunctive provision after the Circuit Court of Appeals had thrown it out. But the West Virginia-Pittsburgh case, unlike the Hitchman case, was not appealed to the Supreme Court; the injunction stood as modified by the Circuit Court of Appeals. And Judge Baker felt obliged to construe it as it stood. Abandoning its old injunction, the West Virginia-Pittsburgh Company commenced suit to obtain a new one, and Judge Baker on May 19 granted a preliminary order restraining the United Mine Workers from peacefully persuading employees of the company to join the union. The text of the opinion is not yet at hand. But presumably, as in the Hitchman case, the non-union miners are under "contract" not to join a union while they remain in the company's employ; to persuade them to do so is therefore an "irreparable" injury to the company's property (that is, contract) rights, from which, as it has "no adequate remedy at law," it is entitled to injunctive protection. We are glad to see it reported that Charles Evans Hughes has volunteered to assist the United Mine Workers in an attempt to overthrow this preliminary injunction. Some 300 men and women are in jail in West Virginia on charges of contempt of injunctions obtained by open-shop operators.

GEORGE EDWARD WOODBERRY'S seventieth birthday did not pass without the notice it deserved from friends, admirers, and former pupils. The recent dinner which celebrated the occasion and which brought Mr. Woodberry for a moment out of his retirement only emphasized, however, the degree of that retirement. For a number of years this poet and critic, who once was looked to for counsel and example, showing American literature how it should go, has lived so quietly and spoken so seldom—and then only to the closest of his followers—that he has begun to seem almost historic. It is perhaps a pity that this trainer and inspirer of youth should ever have had the experience of watching at work a generation which does not understand or at any rate heed him. Something just a little timid and overfine in his critical make-up seems to be responsible, although there may be accidental factors of which no one knows. Doubtless an injustice is involved, and doubtless another generation will be more ready than this one to recognize the subtlety and beauty of Mr. Woodberry's mind. As for *The Nation*, it is pleased to remember the valuable services which Mr. Woodberry rendered as reviewer.

New Wars and Old Debts

THE new war in Morocco is turning to dust Caillaux's dream of balancing the French budget and beginning to repay the inter-Allied debts—just as it is smashing the unity of the Left Bloc which has governed France since May, 1924. Herriot and Painlevé followed the course of many weak liberal governments: they began their reforms at home, but left the old empire-builders in the colonies. Now they are reaping the harvest.

Marshal Lyautey, governor of Morocco, is the greatest of the French empire-builders. His energy and ability have transformed Morocco in a decade from a protectorate of doubtful value into a firmly held colony; his imagination has linked North Africa with Central and realized Poincaré's boast that France is a nation of a hundred million people, three-fifths African. Lyautey first sent airplanes across the desert to the Niger River, then caterpillar automobiles; then he organized a trans-Sudan service. His pomp has fascinated the untutored natives; but he has never ceased to be a military man. He won the respect but not the love of the tribes. When Abd-el-Krim drove the Spaniards down to the sea Lyautey, instead of conciliating him, ordered outposts into the valley of the Werga in the neutral zone, and cut off Abd-el-Krim's food supply. He hoped thus to provide that the bulk of the Spanish zone would later "drop like a ripe fruit into France's lap." Instead its tribes have hurled themselves upon France like a pest of hornets; and although France is sending Senegalese and dark-skinned troops instead of her own sons into the field the cost is none the less tremendous. Whole fleets have to be requisitioned, supplies purchased—horses, food, guns, ammunition.

The endless drain of a full-sized foreign war has begun. The Government far off in Paris let trouble grow upon it unawares, leaving decisions to Lyautey on the spot; and now it does not know where to turn. The Socialists, hitherto supporters of the Government, have turned upon it with a demand that Lyautey be replaced by a civil commissar. The Arab attack has been stalled; it has not been routed or discouraged, while behind the French lines rise ominous rumors of revolt. The curse of empire is returning to rot the proud glory of the would-be empire-builders.

Just at this moment the American Government reminds France that she owes us money. Indeed Washington—stung, no doubt, by home criticism—has sent "reminders" to all her European creditors, presumably even to Liberia to whom we lent \$26,000 to pay the expenses of the Liberian Peace Commission at Versailles. And all the European governments are replying politely that they have the most earnest intention of repaying us if and when and as they can. The whole affair is, as a matter of fact, a miserable example of the way in which governments use words to deceive peoples, but no one seems disturbed by that aspect of it.

Take Mussolini's reply, for example. The New York Times headlines its dispatch "Mussolini Pledges War Debt Payment; Premier Cheered in Italian Senate When He Promises 'to the Last Cent.' Wants Long Moratorium." What did Mussolini really say? The Times tells us, though the headlines give scant idea of it:

The Italian Government recognizes its war debts and intends that Italy shall make good its liabilities to the last cent permitted by its present and future economic situation. . . . However . . . we must have a moratorium . . . [which] will have to be a long one. . . . We should get centuries wherein to pay.

Which, translated into American, would read somewhat thus:

Don't bother me; I'm busy, and I haven't any spare cash. I know I owe the money, but I can't pay it now and I won't be able to for a long time to come. Honest, I'll pay you—if I ever can.

France puts it more pleasantly. Caillaux has proposed to set aside a hundred million dollars annually, which France expects from the Dawes Plan, to repay the United States and Great Britain for their war-time loans. This sounds like real money; it is, indeed, an honest program than any French finance minister before Caillaux had put forth.

It is the first proposal to pay anything on account. But translate it into relative terms, and see what it amounts to. France owes the United States about four billion dollars, and Great Britain about three. Interest on those sums, at 3 per cent—which is what Great Britain is paying us—amounts to \$210,000,000 per annum. The entire fund with which Caillaux proposes to start paying the debt would cover less than half of the annual interest charges! And if France sinks deeper and deeper into Moroccan war, she is going to need every sou of that paltry sum, and more too, for the expenses. Just where does the United States come in?

That is precisely the point which Washington seems to ignore. We may be able to get a little money back on the debts—but, except from England, not much. (It may be hard on England to have to pay more than the others, but that is a penalty which she pays for her financial honesty in taxing herself strenuously and for her solvency. Some newspapers talk as if it would be necessary to reduce England's terms if we make lower terms for others; that is not necessarily the case among nations any more than among individuals. If several debtors go bankrupt each pays what he can.)

But there is more than money at stake, although our Government, by talking only of money, has almost let its chance slip. These debts might have been used as a weapon for peace and an instrument of policy. When the Ruhr invasion was in gestation the United States might have been a powerful influence for pacification by insisting that its debts be heeded before new debts were contracted. There is infinite danger here, of course, of entanglement in European politics; but surely it would have been the right of the United States, creditor—and no greedy right—to have insisted, when France was lending money to arm Poland and Czecho-Slovakia and Yugoslavia, that we had a prior lien on her resources.

It is true that our Debt Funding Commission is not permitted by the terms of its creation to consider such factors. But the fact is that, the commission being so bound, the Administration has chosen its own way of hinting or not hinting to Europe. The problem, as we have suggested, is not simple. If American opinion drifts as

it is now drifting it will soon come to demanding a Dawes Plan for France and other nations as well. They are, in fact, bankrupt as Germany was. The United States, if it continues to demand payment in full, may find itself obligated to offer advice and assistance toward making such payment possible—with all the implications of interference and entanglement which that would mean. Do we want that? Thus far, we have hardly even thought about it.

News from the Hub

BOSTON is the Hub of the Universe. So at least we grew up to believe, and we should not venture a contrary opinion were it not that Boston's standing has been assailed by a correspondent who is himself a Bostonian. Our correspondent has been reading predictions that the newspapers are about to be supplanted by the radio, and he writes about the situation as it appears to him as follows:

While that transformation would perhaps be acceptable enough in New York and Chicago and San Francisco and other large centers of population, where the news of the day as chronicled in the papers could perfectly well be told by an announcer in a few minutes of conversation, certainly Boston and its environs never will accept such a substitution. We of this neighborhood are not interested in the curt bulletins of so-called news which fill the air and the newspapers of New York and other metropolitan regions. What kings and countesses and presidents are doing or may do cannot stir us. Our local papers are more than mere records of stupid world doings.

I have before me at this moment the evening edition of one of the most successful newspapers in the world, our leading Boston journal, and it contains not one thing that could be announced by radio—not one item that would not be lost utterly without the printed page. In it I find fifty-three accounts, many illustrated, of class banquets, surprise parties, handkerchief showers, club theatricals, veteran firemen's balls, lodge anniversaries, costume parties, golden weddings, school concerts, whist parties, club receptions, gift presentations, scout conferences, church reunions, salesmen's luncheons, checker tourneys, ladies' aid suppers. And besides all this there are items on all the local rum seizures, baseball scores, burglaries, deaths and funerals, divorces, real-estate sales, radio features—and there are the puzzles, the funny pictures, the household hints, and the advice to people in love, people who are sick, people who want to build sanitary hen-houses; there are local briefs from twenty-one nearby towns. On the first page, besides the death of a ball player, a highway robbery, and a complete weather report, there is the story of how an epidemic of measles caused the cancelation of a church supper out in Methuen.

Our correspondent incloses a stack of clippings which go far to substantiate his unkind conclusions in regard to Boston. We read, for instance:

The annual dance of the Pirates of Charlestown was held last evening in Roughan Hall, City sq. A large gathering was present. The guest of honor was Fire Commissioner Theodore A. Glynn, who conveyed the greetings of the city of Boston to the club. He was introduced by Joseph W. Blake, chairman of the dance committee.

An open "Frisco" contest was won by George Boyle of Somerville. "Toots" Mondello gave an exhibition.

Enjoyable as it undoubtedly was, we admit that the annual dance of the Pirates of Charlestown was hardly an event of cosmopolitan significance. Nor do we feel any throb of

universal importance when we read the information that

Jere F. Hannan, manager of the Ginter Company's Summer-st. store, was presented by fellow employes with an electric table lamp at the close of business last night. Mr. Hannan is to be married tomorrow evening at St. Leo's Church to Miss Kathleen O. Richards of 8 Standish st., Dorchester.

If Boston is indeed the center of world intelligence and human activities, then we get little suggestion of it from such headlines as "Hyde Park A. O. H. Auxiliary to Give 'My Irish Rose' to Aid Church," or "Will Turn West Newton Armory into Firehouse Monday Evening." Nor do we fare better when our eye rests on some advice on chicken-raising to "Dear Happy Married" from "Mrs. Rhode Island Red," or when—in reading the news from Quincy—we learn that there has been a slight "blaze" in Mr. McGilvray's drug-store and that they are repaving Hancock Street between Beach and Bridge.

On this showing Boston would seem to be less the Hub of the Universe than the balloon tire.

The Norton Professorship

HARVARD University has an extremely generous and valuable alumnus in Charles C. Stillman. Not content with purchasing several pieces of real estate situated at strategic points, and offering to hold them indefinitely for the future development of the university, Mr. Stillman has founded the Charles Eliot Norton Professorship of Poetry and the Fine Arts. This position is to be filled by men of any nationality but of international reputation; the incumbent will be bound to give six public lectures annually on poetry.

Since it is adequately endowed, this professorship should attract a personality worthy of the subject and worthy of the man in whose honor the professorship is named.

This form of perpetuating Mr. Norton's name naturally commends itself to *The Nation*, for he was one of its founders and its ardent supporter throughout his entire life. Indeed Mr. Godkin once wrote to him that "if the paper succeeds I shall always ascribe it to you, as without your support and encouragement I do not think I should have been able to endure to the end." Professor Norton wrote in reply: "It [*The Nation*] is my best claim to the gratitude of posterity."

We should, however, be grateful to Mr. Stillman if his commemoration of Mr. Norton had had no relation to *The Nation* whatever, for Mr. Norton expressed in his lectures not only the highest artistic ideals, he interpreted the art history of Europe to his students in terms of the living world. His lecture course, Fine Arts 4, was attended by many young barbarians because it was easy—"a snap"—a course to be "boned up" in a few days before the examinations. Many of these came openly to scoff; to them Professor Norton was a "grouch," a pessimist, because he did not believe that America led the world in everything, including the arts.

Even then the young hundred per centers would listen to no words of advice or admonition, and when in 1898 Professor Norton assumed the anti-imperialist attitude and opposed both the war with Spain and the conquest of the Philippines, he was, of course, dubbed a "little American," a faithless American, if not a traitor. Professor Norton

loved the old America; he could not bear to see it forsake its true grandeur among nations to walk, a servile imitator, in the paths of the swashbuckling, conquering, colonizing nations.

We hope, in some other and better sphere, he is conscious of Mr. Stillman's act. It would reward him, indeed, for many a disappointment in his students to know that among the thousands who sat on those benches and refused to feel as he did about the paganism of his time, about the subordination of the spiritual America to imperialism and big business, there was one who heard with such gratitude and reverence that after twenty-eight years he proceeded to honor his teacher so admirably. To all of the present teachers of Harvard this happening cannot fail to be stimulating. If the arrows of the teacher fall to earth, he often knows not where, here is proof that sometimes they *do* reach the mark.

To not many is it given to pay tribute in such manner as can Mr. Stillman; that is his happiness and privilege. But there are many, we are certain, who in their riper years have come to understand the nobility of the teacher and appreciate more than ever the sound wisdom of the master, the uncanny prophecies of the patriot who foresaw still other departures from worth-while American traditions. And among those we subscribe ourselves.

Our Changing Army

IN an unusual degree Nelson A. Miles typified the volunteer soldier of the Civil War who subsequently rose to high military command in the regulars. A clerk when the war broke out, he early attracted attention to himself, although but a first lieutenant; the end of the struggle between the States found him a brigadier general, in charge, at Appomattox, of the First Division of the Second Army Corps—the division which lost more men in actual fighting than any other of the Union army. He was then but twenty-six years of age and he was immediately transferred to the regular army as a colonel, obtaining his promotion to brigadier general in 1880.

As an Indian fighter in the West he showed energy, ambition, and enterprise. If he was not comparable as a strategist to one of his Indian antagonists, Chief Joseph of the Nez Percés, who conducted for months one of the most remarkable retreats in military history, General Miles's youth and vigor stood him in good stead and enabled him to shine beside many of the older officers who were trained for the military career. In due course he succeeded, in 1895, to the command of the army and held that position until his retirement in 1903. Because of conflicts with higher authority he was not allowed to play the foremost role in the little war with Spain, though he commanded well the minor expedition to Porto Rico, and his retirement for age was unaccompanied, because of Theodore Roosevelt's antagonism, by the usual eulogistic order summarizing his career.

It would be idle to assert that General Miles was a great man or to deny he was intensely vain—so much so that this failing seriously interfered with his later career. But it is immensely to his credit that throughout his army life he remained true to the traditions of that extraordinary citizen army of 1861-65, of which, General Pershing says, General Miles was the last surviving Union general. He

might, and he did on frequent occasions, blow his own trumpet and see himself President of the United States, but he was never one to go up and down the country preaching militarism and the military career. In this he was like all the commanders of the Civil War period—notably Sherman and Grant.

Men of this sort were content to be leaders of an army of 25,000 men after the conflict of the States, and it never occurred to them that our country was humiliated or its national existence endangered because it was the fortunate possessor of one of the tiniest armies in the world.

Indeed, many of the survivors of the Civil War looked askance upon the needless war with Spain and our bloody adventure in the Philippines, with which later adventure General Miles sympathized privately not at all. More than that, he was as humane a soldier as it is possible to be, and when he discovered that the army in the Philippines had taken over the water-cure torture and other abominable practices he took immediate steps to bring offenders to book and to stop the outrages. He wrote: "I would rather that any official act of my life might be erased than to have omitted discharging a duty that was prompted by a sense of justice and humanity, to preserve the good name of the army." Most soldiers would have believed that the thing to do would be to hush up all scandals, deny everything, and then accuse the accuser of blackening the name of our peerless army.

We have changed the old order now and there is no denying that the new soldier is a much more efficient military machine than the soldier of 1861 to 1900. Just as we have advanced toward European military standards, so have we increased our effectiveness; but we have done it at the price of accepting militaristic theories and practices which would shock and horrify the generation of soldiers who saved the Republic. No one ever heard General Miles or his associates urge compulsory military service for peace time; or the building up of a reserve force of 95,000 officers; or a regular army of 250,000; or summer camps for training 50,000 citizens yearly; or a militia of 200,000 under national control—especially after a war to end war.

One has only to see how our officers of today wear their more practical, businesslike, and unpicturesque uniforms, or to watch any modern regiment drill, to realize how great is the military advance since General Nelson A. Miles was commander-in-chief and we sent troops to Cuba with black-powder cartridges, fed our men on "embalmed beef," and dressed them for the tropics in heavy serge uniforms. But with this advance has come the acceptance of military manners, ideals, and propaganda imported directly from Berlin. We vanquished the Germans only to see the acceptance by our professional soldiers and still more professional patriots of most of the Berlin philosophy we began by reviling.

The uniform and patriotism have become a symbol. It is not without significance that our officers of today wear their uniforms constantly, whereas those of General Miles's active service donned theirs only for actual drill or duty. The army officer is being taught to regard the President as a sacred personage entirely beyond criticism exactly as the Prussian officer had to consider the Kaiser anointed of God. We have our military and naval men openly opposing further disarmament just as the Kaiser's officers opposed the Hague conferences. For all their shortcomings the old-time soldiers seem to us the wiser and truer patriots.

The A B C of Relativity*

By BERTRAND RUSSELL

I. Why Clocks and Foot-Rules Mislead

IT is generally recognized by the public that Einstein has done something astonishing, has in some way revolutionized our conception of the physical world. But what he has done is so wrapped up in mathematical technicalities that it is almost impossible for non-mathematicians to make out its import from the accounts of specialists, while popular accounts usually suggest ideas which are not wholly correct. For this, the word relativity is partly to blame. People often imagine that the new theory proves *everything* to be relative, whereas, on the contrary, it is wholly concerned to exclude what is relative and arrive at a statement of physical laws that shall in no way depend upon the circumstances of the observer. It is true that these circumstances have been found to have more effect upon what appears than they were formerly thought to have, but at the same time Einstein showed how to discount this effect completely. This was the source of almost everything that is surprising in his theory.

It is interesting to compare Einstein and Copernicus. Before Copernicus people thought that the earth stood still and the heavens revolved about it once a day. Copernicus taught that "really" the earth rotates once a day and the daily revolution of sun and stars is only "apparent." Galileo and Newton indorsed this view, and many things were thought to prove it—for example, the flattening of the earth at the poles and the fact that bodies are heavier there than at the Equator. But in the modern theory the question between Copernicus and his predecessors is merely one of convenience. All motion is relative, and there is no difference between the two statements: "The earth rotates once a day" and "The heavens revolve round the earth once a day." The two mean exactly the same thing, just as it means the same thing if I say that a certain length is six feet or two yards. Astronomy is easier if we take the sun as fixed than if we take the earth, just as accounts are easier in a decimal coinage. But to say more for Copernicus is to assume absolute motion, which is a fiction. All motion is relative, and it is a mere convention to take one body as at rest. All such conventions are equally legitimate, though not all are equally convenient.

When two observers perceive what is regarded as one occurrence there are certain similarities and also certain differences between their perceptions. If two men both listen to a third man speaking, and one of them is nearer to him than the other, the nearer one will hear louder and slightly earlier sounds than are heard by the other. If two men both watch a tree falling, they see it from different angles. In the case of the other senses the differences between the perceptions of different people are even more evident. The physicist professionally believes—whatever he may fear in moments of nightmare—that his science gives information, or at least can give information, about what really occurs in the physical world, and not merely about the private perceptions of separate observers. Now

if the physicist is justified in this belief, physics must be concerned with those features which a physical process has in common for all observers, since such features alone can be regarded as belonging to the physical occurrence itself. This requires that the *laws* of phenomena should be the same whether the phenomena are described as they appear to one observer or as they appear to another. This simple principle is the generating motive of the whole relativity theory.

When I speak of the differences between the perceptions of different observers perceiving the same physical process I am not thinking of differences due to what may be called psychological causes, such as diverse interests or intellectual attainments. Nor am I thinking of differences due to physiological causes, such as keener sight or better hearing. I am thinking of such differences as remain in cinematograph or gramophone records taken from different standpoints. Differences of this sort are physical, and any proper theory of physics must account for them. But the first step in accounting for the *differences* between two records of the same physical occurrence is to establish clearly what are the *likenesses*, i. e., what there must be in common between two records each of which is accurate from its own point of view. For until we have done this we cannot say what belongs to the physical occurrence itself and what belongs merely to the situation of the spectator.

At this point the reader may exclaim that the problem of allowing for the spectator's point of view is one of which physics has at all times been fully aware, and that, at any rate since Copernicus, it has dominated astronomy. There is some truth in this, but principles are often acknowledged long before their full consequences are drawn. Much of traditional physics is incompatible with the principle, although it was acknowledged theoretically by all physicists.

There existed a set of rules, which caused uneasiness to the philosophically minded, but were accepted by physicists because they worked in practice. These were, to all intents and purposes, the rules which followed from Locke's doctrine that secondary but not primary qualities are subjective. Colors and noises, in this theory, are subjective, but are due to waves which proceed with a definite velocity—that of sound or of light as the case may be—from their source to the eye or ear of the percipient. Shapes vary according to the laws of perspective, but these laws are simple and make it easy to infer the "real" shape from several visual apparent shapes; moreover, the "real" shape can be ascertained by touch, in the case of bodies in our neighborhood. The objective time of a physical occurrence can be inferred from the time when we perceive it by allowing for the velocity of transmission—of light or sound or nerve currents, according to circumstances. This was the view adopted by physicists in practice, whatever qualms they may have had in unprofessional moments.

This view worked well enough until physicists became concerned with velocities comparable to that of light. Then it was found to lead to expectations which experiment failed to verify. Einstein has shown that this ought to have been foreseen, since the line drawn, in the orthodox

* This is the first of four articles by Bertrand Russell explaining the Einstein theory of relativity.

theory, between what belongs to the point of view and what to the occurrence itself involved contradictions, though these were only noticed when experiment had shown that something was wrong.

Orthodox physics arose at a time when the world seemed far more solid and stable than the modern physicist will permit it to be. It was primarily concerned with occurrences on the surface of the earth, whose relative velocities are very small. Within the limits of accuracy practically attainable, different clocks and foot-rules, on the surface of the earth, if they are carefully constructed, give concordant results when applied to the measurements of times and distances. Accordingly it was thought that our measurements of times and distances expressed objective properties of the things measured. This has turned out to be an illusion, due to the accident that we and the things measured had a very small relative velocity. What we have hitherto regarded as the space-time properties of physical occurrences are in large part dependent upon the observer; only a residue can be attributed to the occurrences in themselves, and only this residue can be involved in the formulation of any physical law which is to have an a priori chance of being true. Einstein found ready to his hand an instrument of pure mathematics, called the theory of tensors, which enabled him to find laws, expressed in terms of the objective residue, agreeing approximately with the old laws. Where Einstein's laws differed from the old ones, they have hitherto proved more in accord with observation.

The kind of difficulties which arise in the search for objective space-time can be apprehended more easily in astronomy than in terrestrial measurements. The orbit of a planet is not permanently marked out in space, like a road or railway; it is inferred from observations of the planet on different occasions. Relatively to the sun the orbit of Mercury is approximately an ellipse, but relatively to the earth it is a very complicated curve. In arguing, from observation, that Mercury is in such-and-such a place at such-and-such a time, we estimate the time by terrestrial clocks, and the place by calculations based upon terrestrial measures. In estimating the time, we allow for the velocity with which light is propagated, and it was thought until recently that in this way we could establish an objective relation of simultaneity between, say, the beginning of a transit of Venus and a certain position of the hands of a certain clock. It turned out, however, that we were mistaken in this. Two events may appear simultaneous to one observer who has taken all due precautions to insure accuracy, while another equally careful observer may judge that the first event preceded the second, and a third may judge that the second preceded the first. This would happen if the three observers were all moving rapidly relatively to each other. The time-order of events is therefore in part dependent upon the observer; it is not altogether and always an intrinsic relation between the events themselves. How experiment has forced this conclusion upon physicists I shall try to explain in my next article.

Bad Peanuts and Big Business

By ROBERT HAMMOND MURRAY

OLD Dad Cowan. I hadn't thought of Dad in years. He leaped back into memory, unsummoned and vivid, while I was discontentedly plodding my way through a book about an oil lawsuit in Mexico and at each paragraph prodding my reluctant brain to keep it up to its work. Otherwise I and it would have quit on the job after the first page. A dull, dour book, to be fancifully likened, because of its drab garb, to a glooming Covenanter elder, grimly exultant at carrying on his spiritual traffickings within agreeable sniffing distance of the Pit's fire and brimstone. Dad came to my mind, I expect, as the result of those freakish mental gymnastics in which one's brain indulges itself at intervals, without rhyme or reason.

My earliest experiences in merchandising—I may have been seven or eight years old at the time—in laying down money on a counter and receiving in exchange suitable return in candy or kindred commodities agreeable to the juvenile palate, were with Dad. He kept a shop of sorts next to the school playground, sparsely stocked with pencils, slates, paper pads, sponges, and other minor mechanical aids to primary scholastic progress. He dispensed toys and taffy, which latter delicacy he cooked in the kitchen behind the shop, where he ate, slept, and otherwise fended for himself. Dad also sold peanuts, which he roasted in a corpulent sheet-iron cylinder over a charcoal fire.

I can see Dad now, turning the cylinder of the peanut roaster, sitting in an ancient rush-bottomed chair, pipe in mouth, his wooden peg-leg thrust out stiffly in front of him with its brassbound end projecting over the irregularly

rotted outer edge of the porch and shining in the sun like a good deed in a naughty world. Dad kept the brass on the end of his wooden leg in a state of high polish. I have seen him stump back indoors after a stroll on a rainy day, when the crosswalks were muddy, and immediately set himself to the removal of every trace of mud from the brass with a rag which he took from beneath the counter.

Dad was an old man. He had fought in the Mexican War and lost a leg at Buenavista. As I recall, some irregularity in his enlistment or in his discharge papers barred him from proving his right to a pension. He was crippled with rheumatism. Between Dad and starvation stood only the proceeds of the shop.

Perhaps I recall Dad most clearly in connection with certain transactions involving peanuts. Those were the days, back in the uncomplicated early eighties, when copper cents constituted the chief currency of the child. A cent was opulence, a nickel was wealth, and a dime was reckoned as the riches of Ind. Current quotations for peanuts, for the adult market, stood firm and unchanged at ten cents the quart and five cents the pint. For the accommodation of indigent youth Dad sold peanuts on what may be termed a sub-retail basis at the rate of twenty for a cent. If, upon investigation, which was invariably made upon the spot by the investor in a cent's worth of peanuts, any of the peanuts proved to be duds Dad promptly would hand over to the vendee another and perfect peanut. There was never any argument about it.

Dad's scrupulousness in guaranteeing and effectively

underwriting without reservation the integrity of his peanuts made a profound and lasting impression upon me. The permanent and inspiring faith in the honesty and virtuous purpose of all men, which is a fetish with me still in the middle years of disillusionment, unquestionably had its foundation in my contact with Dad. For reasons, the precise nature of which I do not now remember, the local educational authorities did not regard Dad with favor. He had no social, commercial, or sectarian standing. Dimly it seems to me that the bruit was that Dad tanked up with systematic and successful regularity each Saturday night. Be that as it may, finally the hand of the righteous smote Dad crushingly. His high standard of honor in the matter of peanuts stood him not in stead when the evil days came. They got rid of the old man and his shop by choking his trade to death. This was managed by establishing within the precincts of the school itself a morally prophylactic official mart for the dispensing of school supplies and hygienic sweets; orders went forth that thenceforward such children as were detected in carrying on commercial or social relations with Dad should be severely dealt with, according to the laws and statutes made and provided by parents and tutors. We children lamented for Dad, but the constituted authorities had the bulge on us and we were coerced into sacrificing friendship upon the imperious altar of expediency and *force majeure*.

The book I was speaking about contains the plaintiffs' complaint in a lawsuit which a few weeks ago was commenced in the Mexican courts by certain Mexican owners of land in the state of Vera Cruz against one of the important American oil companies operating in Mexico. After I got into the entrails of the book, with my mental and physical batteries recharged through refreshing retrospect on Dad and his rigid impeccability in the matter of peanuts, I found the going easier.

This American oil company, I read, made a contract with the Mexican landowners, some of whom were women, under which it pledged itself to exploit the property in question and pay the owners a royalty of 10 per cent in kind, to be liquidated in cash at the market price of the oil. But the company did not do this. It appears that from the day upon which the company began to extract oil from the subsoil it started to skin the landowners. It skinned them for eleven years, from 1913 until 1924. The oil company appears to have been pretty small and mean about it too. Petty larceny-ish, in fact. For example, in 1913, when the first well on the property came into production, the royalties due the owners amounted to 17.20 barrels of oil, for which the company should have paid them \$13.76, at the prevailing market rate of eighty cents American gold a barrel. Instead of which the company held out on the landowners and paid them only \$3.53, thereby gouging them to the tune of \$10.23.

But the gouging speedily grew better after that and graduated from petty to grand larceny. For instance, in 1918, the company under its contract should have paid the landowners in royalties the impressive sum of \$929,978.10. But it turned over to them \$153,985.39, thereby swindling them out of \$825,082.71. And so it went until in some manner a representative of the landowners obtained access to the company's books. The books showed that the difference between what the company, according to its contract, was bound to pay the landowners and what it actually did pay them totaled the enormous amount of \$3,274,345.55

in United States currency. Now the landowners are suing the company to recover what they affirm the American oil company stole from them.

Personally and out of my knowledge of what some of the American oil companies have been up to in Mexico, both in their dealings with the government and the Mexican landowners, I have not the slightest doubt that the facts as stated in the book are correct and that eventually the oil company will be compelled to disgorge. One of the reasons why I think so is because several pages in the book are devoted to setting forth the progress and outcome of an exactly similar action at law which last year was waged to a triumphant conclusion for the robbed property owners in the Supreme Court of Mexico against another foreign oil corporation, a European company. The sum this European company filched from the persons from whom it leased richly producing oil lands was much less, amounting to something like a million pesos. After the company had been defeated at each step of the litigation, and been detected in bribing a judge by giving him 25,000 pesos for a favorable decision, it settled with the defrauded landowners by paying them \$500,000 to cover part of the value of the swag and the expense of collecting it.

When I had finished the book, with a mental apology to it for having earlier damned it as stupid and uninteresting, I took down from the shelf the "Directory of Directors" and "Who's Who in America." From the first I picked out the names of the officers, directors, and the owners of the American oil company. Then I ran them down in "Who's Who." Eminently distinguished and representative gentlemen of big affairs and big business, all. Most of them graduates of high-class institutions of learning, Harvard, Columbia, Princeton, Yale, Cornell, etc. Members of exclusive clubs. Polo players, some of them. Opera-box holders. Officers of this, that, and the other philanthropic, educational, uplifting, scientific, and what-not institutions. Donors of large sums for good works. A few wear medals of honor for patriotic service rendered to the United States in the war. Church affiliations modestly mentioned. Very, very respectable, substantial gentlemen of unimpeachable standing in the business, the religious, and the social worlds. Rich men. Therefore successful men. And equally, therefore, respectable and respected men.

And yet, I thought, these gentlemen permit their petroleum company in Mexico to steal more than 3,250,000 good American dollars as deliberately, sinfully, and cynically as a hold-up man in Chicago jams his revolver into the wame of a night-faring pedestrian and lifts his watch and wallet! That is the only exclamation point with which I have permitted myself to dissipate in this modest preachment. I think I've earned it.

About the end of old Dad Cowan. Dad had to go to the poorhouse. He died there. No medals of honor from his government for him. It wouldn't grant him even a pension of \$8 a month for the leg shot off in the Mexican War. But I'll stake whatever chances of salvation are left me that if ever a thoroughly honest man lived and deserved to get on it was Dad. When he sold a child a bad peanut, at the rate of twenty for a cent, he gave him a good peanut for the bad one. Probably that ingenuous eccentricity had as much as anything else to do with landing Dad in the poorhouse. Dad would have made a pathetic fizzle of the oil business in Mexico as it is carried on by some of the big American oil companies.

Race Pride and Race Prejudice*

By HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER

THE very claim of a group that it is inherently superior suggests that it is not, for that is the claim all other groups make. The Greeks and Barbarians, the English and the Irish, the Japanese and Koreans, the Chinese and Europeans, the native and foreign born, the Nordic and Alpine, the aristocracy and the proletariat, the black and the white, the Northern Negro and the Southern, men and women, Catholics and Jews, all think so much alike about one another that the very consistency makes the world's great tragedy of errors.

The factors which result in this phenomenon may be divided into those which are immediate and capricious, and those which are derived and rationalized. We fear and despise the unfamiliar. The first sight of a physical deformity may make us shudder with horror. Every race on first sight of another will probably feel a revulsion. My New Hampshire grandmother was an ardent Abolitionist, but she could not "stomach" food served by a Negro waiter. A white woman of my acquaintance familiar with Negroes almost fainted the first time she shook hands with a Chinese. Such a reaction is so immediate that it seems to be instinctive. Whenever these visible signs accompany social and political status the feeling of revulsion seems to be rational and one easily justified.

When groups have lived together a long time there is an accepted status, while it is accepted no progress is made in separating fact from myth. Although men and women have lived in the same society from the beginning of time only now has an organized attempt been made toward the disillusionment and emancipation of women. Plato said "a woman is only a lesser man." Over two thousand years later Hegel said even more uncomplimentary things about her. Everything has been said to prove the inferiority of women that has been offered to prove the inferiority, say, of the Negro. In regard to marriage it is not necessary to go to interracial situations to find violent antipathy. My wife's grandfather and grandmother belonged to different sects of the Quakers and when they married both were "turned out of meeting." My Yankee mother married a Swede and her mother was never quite reconciled. In India intermarriage between castes is quite as unthinkable as between Indians and English. The suggestion of interracial marriage seems shocking to many people, but there is just as much shock when a sense of status is offended by inter-group marriage.

Again the opinion is accepted axiomatically by the successful business man, and by most clerks and their wives as well, that the working class is naturally inferior, else why should it be the working class? In 1906 Lester F. Ward said that he had found only one writer, and he an unknown one, who had a different view of the subject. In spite of living together, the uninformed are confused with

the intelligent. Immigrants, who become natives in two years, laugh at the "Greeners" with a sense of unquestioned superiority, and Northern Negroes consider immigrant Southern Negroes poor stuff.

There is no single explanation for these very positive attitudes. On the one side is group egotism. There is too much disapproval of an egotist to permit him to get full satisfaction from his personal ego urge, and so he turns his egotistical yearnings to magnifying the group to which he belongs, and what was a personal vice becomes a social virtue, and still retains all the emotional satisfaction. He may be Babbitt in the booster's club of Zenith, or a humble, retired farmer from Iowa who moves to California and becomes as unblushing a braggart in his field as Nordics of the McDougall-Stoddard-Ku Klux Klan type are in theirs. We share in the importance of what we magnify. Now that we are becoming conscious of race it offers another avenue of escape. And this group loyalty is exploited, just as personal vanity may be, but more easily, because we are less on our guard. Selfish interests use national and racial pride for the purpose of keeping down wages, continuing men in office, or selling newspapers.

Thus race prejudice has its exact psychological counterpart in other familiar prejudices where there is no suggestion of race, and we may suspect, at least, that racial explanations of social differences have no validity further than the marks of race designate the bounds of the group.

There are, however, conditions which make the racial factors peculiarly distinctive. When two races first come into contact there probably never is an even balance of power and initiative. The situation is made more complex and the issue obscured because one dominates and exploits the other. This power may be exercised by force of arms, political organization, or by mere control of cultural institutions such as the school, press, and church, or by the mere possession of cultural prestige.

The result of domination is a difference in status of the racial groups. Up to the last century such differences have been accepted as in the order of nature, but recently there has been a whirlwind growth of resentment on the part of those who have an inferior status. This applies to races, women, nations, and unprivileged classes. On the other side, there is the growth of fear among those in control, with a consequent process of rationalization to prove their inherent right to keep things as they are. This is what we now have in the Nordics. They claim to see in the last four hundred years of freebooting by the whites of Northwestern Europe some divine plan which they must help God to carry out. The fundamentalists with their transcendent God and the pseudo-scientists with their natural laws frantically join forces. They may succeed in satisfying their group egos; but scientists will have to dismiss these Nordic claims as a defense complex.

We cannot deny that many so-called "race characteristics" actually exist. Isolated or dominated groups do acquire relatively fixed habits, many of which may be only technique for equalizing the situation. Women weep while men bluster and swear to get the same results. Jewish

* This is the final article in a series on the Nordic Myth. Previous articles in the series have appeared as follows: What Is a Race? by Franz Boas, January 28; Brains and the Immigrant, by Melville J. Herskovits, February 11; Let Race Alone, by Edward Sapir, February 25; You Nordics! by Konrad Bercovici, March 18; Our Nordic Myth-Makers, by Hendrik Willem van Loon, April 1; Can There Be a "Human Race"? by Alexander Goldenweiser, April 22; The Race Myth Crumbles, by Harry Elmer Barnes, May 6; and A Latin Books North, by Manuel Ugarte, May 20.

aggressiveness was necessary to prevent starvation and to create or assert a feeling of self-respect. In the same way the Negro who says "'scuse me, boss," slips by more easily than one who says "I beg your pardon." This is not native servility; it is tactics.

The methods of revolt by all subordinate groups have been similar. In the first place, the group, like the individual, needs self-respect, and that respect is measured by the respect in which one is held. The Jews keep their self-respect in spite of ages of discrimination through the conviction that they are the chosen people of God. Their very religious allegiance, however, furnishes further basis for discrimination against them. The recent outbreaks of anti-Semitism have turned the minds of many Jews, who were letting go old controls, back to the traditional observances and symbols. It has made Zionism a vital issue.

In the same way the Irish have turned to the church. When I said to a classmate of mine, now a judge, that if England had been Roman Catholic the Irish would have been Protestant, he immediately came back, "Yes, and they would have been damned good Protestants, too." The same man in discussing the Ku Klux Klan said that he considered it the best thing that had ever happened to the church. The Poles are now the most ardent Catholics in the world because Orthodox Russia and Protestant Prussia tried to impose their culture upon them; and for the same reason Czechs, who were subjected to Roman Catholic Austria, became ardent freethinkers.

The white race has been trying to exploit and despise Asia, and at the same time to put over the Christian religion. The result is a growing opposition to Christian missionaries. In the last few years I have found that my Chinese students, whose whole lives have been spent under Christian influences, are saying with great vigor that they wish the missionaries would stay at home. In India there is little doubt that, with the rise of Gandhi and the Nationalist movement, there will be a constantly decreasing influence of Christianity. In Japan the Buddhists are taking on the methods of the Y. M. C. A. and pushing Buddhism. Socialists who represent the exploited class are making socialism their religion and poking fun at the religion of the exploiting classes.

The Negro has not yet found for himself a defensive religion. There is undoubtedly much less respect than formerly for white Christians, and a cult seems to be developing rapidly among young Negroes that repudiate religion. There are a good many followers of Bahaism, and some increase in the tendency to go into the Roman Catholic Church. It may be that, if Gandhi is defied, the colored races will look to him as their Messiah in order to escape the imposition of a white divinity. This is all in process, and it is not as easy to prophesy what will be the particular religious symbolism adopted as that there will be one of some kind.

Although less fundamental than religion, language is more intimate. Since it is impossible for groups to be isolated from one another without developing languages or dialects, when they come in contact the dominant one tries to impose its language. But to be deprived of one's language involuntarily is an invasion of personality, hence everywhere one finds complete disregard of convenience and economic advantage when language is in danger. The Irish are strenuously trying to substitute their own ancient language for the English, which was imposed on them.

Middle Europe is, and long has been, a seething struggle to retain languages which are of small extent, but whose loss would take away self-respect.

A lowly individual may brag about his vices, but a lowly group will look to its accomplishments, and so we have the vicarious appropriation of the merit of heroes. The Jews make a good case for themselves. Negroes are growing in dignity and self-respect as the list of their eminent personalities is extended. The same tendency is evident among women.

After all is said about the common unreasoning basis of prejudices—toward the Jews and the Negroes, for example—there seems to be some evidence that Jews have higher intelligence quotients. There may be an explanation even of this apparent inherent difference. Professor Newell L. Sims in his recent book, "Society and Its Surplus," shows that progress is dependent of the accumulation of surpluses of various sorts. He says:

Psychically considered, surplusage connotes chiefly foresight, originative and inventive ability, and the power of abstract reasoning and speculative thought. . . . Tradition surplus . . . embraces all of human achievement—invention, discovery, art, science, philosophy, literature, and music.

The Jew worked out a method of making up for the deficiencies of his physical and social life by attention to his spiritual life, and he accumulated a great deal of psychical and traditional surplusage. As possibilities for more complete general development open to him there is serious danger that his special contribution may diminish. Some Jewish writers believe that unless Zionism can serve as a substitute for what has kept the Jewish consciousness awake, the world will lose much.

The Negro has no such surpluses. He has no tradition about books, but the very reverse. He may even read or hear that Negroes are supposed to have inferior mental ability; this serves as an inhibition rather than a stimulant. The mother will keep her children out of school Monday morning to gather the wash and Thursday afternoon to deliver it, because school has no organized meaning in her traditions. The Negro needs to accumulate this sort of cultural surplus before he is compared mentally with the Jew.

I have tried to show various ways in which racial egotism may account for prejudices and for apparent racial characteristics. The question of race has three aspects: the attitudes races have toward one another; the attitudes they have toward themselves; and finally, the inherent differences there may be between them. It is clear—after we have explained the first two with the knowledge now available—that what may be left of the third will bear little relation to anything now called the "race problem."

Next Week

the Summer Book Number

of

THE NATION

Class Justice in Germany

By LOUIS FISCHER

Berlin, April 15

LEGAL justice in Germany, as in Soviet Russia, is class justice. In Moscow a member of the bourgeoisie and a member of the proletariat commit the same crime. The worker receives the lesser punishment. In Germany Hitler arranges a Putsch and the Communists plan an insurrection. Hitler spends six months in a palace-prison and is then released to continue his activities; the Reds get ten or fifteen years' hard labor.

E. J. Gumbel, a well-known German pacifist, in a painfully exact and detailed book called "Four Years of Political Murder," gives some illuminating figures on the class standards of German justice. Between January, 1919, and June 24, 1922, when Walter Rathenau was killed, the Rights (Deutsch-Völkische, Hakenkreuzler, Stahlhelm, and other monarchist groups) carried out 354 political assassinations. The total punishment meted out to the perpetrators amounted to 90 years and 2 months' incarceration and one life imprisonment. During the same period the Lefts (Communists) carried out 22 political assassinations. The total punishment was 10 executions, 248 years and 9 months' incarceration, and three life imprisonments.

Another interesting comparison can be made. In March, 1920, the famous Kapp Putsch took place. The Berlin Government was overthrown, Ebert fled, and the entire state apparatus fell into the hands of the monarchists. Subsequently the Ministry of Justice announced that 707 Kappists had been arrested. The great majority was immediately amnestied, 176 were put on trial; of these one, von Jagow, was sentenced to five years in a fortress. Last Christmas this von Jagow was pardoned by the late President Ebert; now he plays the role of national hero in Bavaria. . . . On the other hand 184 persons who participated in the Munich Soviet regime (May-June, 1919) were sentenced to a total of 616 years and 2 months' imprisonment, while three, including Leviné, the head of the government, were shot.

Count Arco Valley, condemned to life imprisonment for murdering Kurt Eisner, Socialist, was released after two years. Ludendorff, Hitler, Lossow, Poehner, and similar heroes of the Munich "brewery Putsch" of November, 1923, were all tried and they are all free. In September, 1923, the Right Hakenkreuzler staged a Putsch at Kustrin, where they attacked the republican army. Over 500 men were arrested, 14 were tried, and 10 were sentenced; a single major now remains in prison. I am assured that this major is one of the few political prisoners of the Right in Germany, that all the Right politicals in Germany can be counted on the fingers of both hands.

In their propaganda literature the Communists claim 7,000 political prisoners in Germany. This figure is an

exaggeration. However, there are between 3,000 and 4,000 already sentenced, and approximately 1,000 awaiting trial. Official totals are of course not to be had. On April 2, 1925, the Minister of Justice of Prussia stated, in reply to an interpellation, that there were 477 political convicts in Prussian prisons. But he certainly excluded Communists sentenced for leading food riots, political strikes, etc. Greater Berlin alone houses several hundred politicals.

Estimates of the number of Communist prisoners in all Germany are formed on the basis of such data as the following: In Württemberg (official statistics) there are 157 Communists serving sentences totaling 177 years; 82 such prisoners are awaiting trial. The *Hamburger Volkszeitung* of October 23, 1924, prints the names of 348 workers sentenced to 661 years for participating in the Hamburg riots of the previous year. Since then as many more have been awarded prison sentences for the same reason. During 1924 the Red Workers Aid gave legal assistance to 18,000 workers. During May and June, 1924, workers were sentenced to 920 years' imprisonment; during August,

September, and October, 1924, to 1,065 years. In March, 1924, the Red Aid paid doles to more than 3,600 wives of Communists serving sentence and awaiting trial; in May to more than 3,400 wives. (The German Republic has never proclaimed a general amnesty.) During 1924 the Red Aid spent 1,400,000 marks in Germany. Of this sum 400,000 marks were collected in Germany, most of the rest was contributed by the inhabitants of Soviet Russia.

It is instructive to compare the figures of the pre-war monarchist, militarist, mailed-fisted Germany. According to the archives of the Social Democratic Party politicals in 1908 received sentences amounting to 20 years, 2 months; in 1909 to 27 years, 10 months; in 1910 to 36 years, 10 months; in 1911 to 26 years, 1 month; in 1912 to 7 years, 8 months; and in 1913 to 13 years, 5 months.

In republican Germany political prisoners receive no privileged treatment. Often they suffer more than ordinary criminals. A political in prison (*Gefängnis*) may write one letter and receive one letter in four weeks; a political doing hard labor (*Zuchthaus*) one letter in eight weeks. They may accept packages and presents from friends outside only once a year—on Christmas Day; newspapers may be read by politicals in solitary confinement but the Communists are supplied with the most ultra-conservative and rabidly monarchist publications. Prisoners in *Zuchthaus* are not permitted to smoke.

One of the worst features of the treatment of politicals is the *Untersuchungshaft*. Communists awaiting trial are kept in prison, and treated no better than men serving sentences, for months, sometimes for more than a year. Then they may be dismissed as innocent. In Stargard,



From the Pravda (Moscow)

Workers' Meetings in Democratic Germany

Pomerania, there are now 120 workers awaiting trial. Some have been there since the end of 1923. Pfeiffer, a former member of the central committee of the German Communist Party and of the Reichstag, has been in a Berlin prison awaiting trial since March, 1924. Maslov, another member of the central committee, has been waiting in jail since June, 1924. Cases of long detention are not infrequent.

Many of the important Communist offenders are tried before the Staatsgerichtshof of Leipzig. This court was established in the summer of 1922 when the authorities, frightened by the murder of Rathenau (which was to have been a signal for a nation-wide monarchist uprising), hastily passed the Law to Protect the Republic. Against whom? Against the monarchist militant groups of the Right. Yet though these groups have been extremely active since 1922 the two assassins of Rathenau and several others who received a few weeks' imprisonment each are the only non-Communists who have been tried before the Staatsgerichtshof. This special court is authorized to pass unusually heavy sentences, and it has been busily engaged in doing so—against Communists alone.

Ten or fifteen years of hard labor is no particular joy. Generally speaking the sentences passed upon German Communists during the past two years have not been severe—which does not mean that many innocents have not been caught along with the guilty in wholesale arrests or that heavy judgments are not meted out to mild sinners. Thus Karl Schneck, editor of the *Süddeutsche Arbeiter Zeitung*, was sentenced to three years' imprisonment for speaking at a Red Aid meeting, and ten Communists got two years each for participating in the same assembly. An editorial in the *Hamburger Volkszeitung* cost the writer one year of his liberty. I have read the court proceedings of trials in which workingmen were condemned to two years' incarceration for distributing ordinary throw-outs.

These same court records testify indisputably to the

attitude of the judges. Communists complain bitterly against Niedner, the presiding justice of the Staatsgerichtshof of Leipzig, and in many respects they are right. In one instance he said to a worker who was being prosecuted before him for stealing weapons from barracks: "If you really committed the act it would have been best to put you against the wall and shoot you." On another occasion he voiced his hatred of Soviet Russia in unmistakable language. In general it is certain that the punishments and sufferings of Communist politicals are aggravated by the circumstance that the Government, the courts, the prison officials, etc., are actuated by a deepseated aversion to Communism and by a thoroughgoing contempt for these non-patriotic, anti-nationalist Reds.

For the rest, the story of politicals in Germany repeats the story of politicals in every other civilized country. There are misdeeds, cruelties, bloody deeds. Prisoners are beaten and forced to sign confessions they have never read. Men awaiting trial are chained hand and foot. A Communist girl of 17 is held in her cell during the last few months of pregnancy. A woman is kicked in the abdomen by a warden. Another female Communist is allowed to deliver her baby in a cold prison cell; it is born dead. Sauber, a member of the Bavarian Landtag, is put into a strait-jacket for "answering back" to a prison official, and thrown into a dark room to lie there for two days without food and drink, without being able to make a single movement. When he tries to yell he is gagged. Two comrades of the party, Kummerfeld and Neubacher, commit suicide while awaiting trial. Men die in prison for lack of proper medical attention. One goes insane. . . . All these cases are affidavited and investigated. Quite regularly, too, the *Rote Fahne*, which, incidentally, was prohibited for 18 of the 52 weeks of 1924, reports prolonged political hunger strikes. It is the story of Soviet Russia with the number of the prisoners increased and the roles reversed.

Too Many College Girls?

By FRED A KIRCHWEY

II. Examinations and Other Tests

THE Eastern women's colleges have no desire to reproduce the hectic life of the State university. They cannot take in even half of the girls who want to enter; they must become selective; and so they seek consciously to draw young women of the type that seems to them most valuable. Entrance requirements have within the last five years been raised and stabilized; examinations are becoming tests of power and maturity rather than mere memory games; school records are looked into, and wherever possible personal interviews are held with candidates. Even so, several of them are faced with the necessity of turning away candidates who successfully, if not brilliantly, meet all these requirements. College entrance becomes strictly competitive, and the need of truly selective tests becomes urgent. The methods of the different colleges vary slightly although their aims are apparently identical. As for their results—a glance at any college campus at noon or between classes is an impressive if unscientific commentary on the results.

What is the combination of qualities that make a girl "good college material"? When one girl is admitted out of two or three who want equally to get in—which does the college choose? In the answer to this question is encompassed the whole value of present selective methods; the whole future of women's education in America.

Bryn Mawr accepts the girl who can pass her entrance examinations with an average grade of 70 per cent. To hold its numbers to its present capacity, less than 400, the Bryn Mawr authorities exclude any girl carrying a single condition. They are, apparently, satisfied with this simple method of restriction. It is fair, it is definite, it aims at a student body with a high level of preparation, and with no hampering deficiencies to be "made up" or "passed off." Last year's entering class was the first to come in wholly "unconditioned." One of the leading professors told me that never had a freshman class done its work with such ease and speed and interest. Its physical quality has never been equaled.

Until 1917 Bryn Mawr was able to accept every qualified applicant. In the fall of 1917 forty more girls passed

their examinations than could be accommodated. Since then students have been admitted on a strictly competitive basis. Only the so-called "old plan" examinations are accepted—a test in each of the subjects required for entrance. School records are also examined and when possible a personal interview with the president or the dean is arranged. By adopting these supplementary tests Bryn Mawr is deliberately drawing closer to the other women's colleges, but it still represents a rather proud and exclusive academic standard. In spite of its rigid demands, however, Bryn Mawr turns away fewer applicants than might be expected. The college applies a system of careful choice from the moment a girl enters her name. If her chances seem small, if her record is mediocre or her first examinations poor, she is tactfully discouraged or diverted to "more suitable" institutions. She is urged to register an application in another college as well or to postpone her entrance a year. If she seems to be "good material" she is encouraged; and the number of girls turned away for failure on their final examinations is surprisingly small. Bryn Mawr has no fear of being swamped. For ten years at least, with the addition of a single dormitory, the authorities feel that they can hold their numbers within the necessary limits by applying this strict standard of admissions.

Does Bryn Mawr lose by the application of its highly selective academic requirements? Certainly none of the other leading women's colleges even in the present emergency puts so much weight on sheer scholarship. Their tests are complicated and flexible. They all—Smith, Vassar, Wellesley, Mt. Holyoke, Radcliffe, Barnard—admit only on examination. (All but Barnard and Radcliffe, which had always required examinations, passed from the certificate to the examination system in 1919—a first step toward stemming the post-war flood of applications.) They all accept and encourage the use of the "comprehensive" examinations, which test applicants in their general knowledge of four comprehensive subject groups instead of offering a series of "preliminaries" and "finals" in the elementary and advanced divisions of each subject. They all apply the "new plan" of admissions, which considers examination ratings along with and in the light of the school record. There are no "conditions" possible under the new plan and the comprehensive examination; a girl receives no marks; she simply learns whether or not she is admitted. If a girl is excellent "college material" she may be admitted with a low rating in one of her four subjects. If she passes everything with good marks her school record may possibly disqualify her. In one historic instance Smith admitted a girl who did badly in all four examinations; she had been at the head of her class all through high school. Her college record is described as a "good average" record. (This case, President Neilson would say, is not a precedent. It may never happen again. But it was an interesting test of the value of school records as a guide to ability.) All the colleges except Bryn Mawr—and Vassar, except under exceptional circumstances—will admit a girl with a single condition; in some she must get rid of it in a year, in some by the end of her sophomore year. But the problem is now a minor one; with competitive admission and the use of the new plan, the number of conditioned students as well as the number of students who "flunk out" has become negligible. Several of the colleges are trying to arrange, through alumnae committees and field agents, for a personal interview with all applicants; even now can-

didates are interviewed whenever possible by the college authorities or by alumnae representatives in various towns. At Barnard, where most of the girls seeking admission are close at hand, the personal interview is a part of the regular routine. Several of the men's colleges, Dartmouth among them, have adopted this procedure.

Vassar and Wellesley still operate a dual system. At Vassar the entrance lists were years ago completely filled through 1929. Candidates if they passed their entrance examinations were admitted in order of application; and the early applicant was likely to be the daughter of a graduate or of professional or well-to-do parents who could plan in advance for the college education of their children. A brilliant girl would be turned away in favor of a mediocre one whose application was filed earlier. As pressure on the college increased President MacCracken, with the consent of the trustees, set aside space in each freshman class for first 10, then 25, then 100 students, entering, irrespective of the date of their applications, by competitive examination. At Wellesley two-thirds of the students enter by the competitive system; the rest according to priority of application.

This situation in both colleges has obvious difficulties; girls are rejected in the competitive examinations who rank far above many who are admitted from the priority list. By 1929 Wellesley will have passed to a strictly competitive basis; and the date of new applications will have no significance. Vassar has put on the competitive list all applications entered since February, 1923, although it still honors applications made prior to that for the same classes. This change has been adopted in both cases—as is doubtless true of the colleges which are wholly competitive—against the opposition of many earnest alumnae who naturally feel that daughters of graduates, entered sometimes at birth, have a special claim on their mothers' college.

No one of these colleges, whatever its difficulties, would consider changing its flexible system of admissions for the more rigid academic methods of Bryn Mawr. The reasons given are generally the same, with a few interesting variations. They all want "good college material" and, with all respect to new methods and subtler tests, they say that no examination can be counted on to provide it. The big preparatory schools, the big-city high schools, have become so expert in getting students ready for college-entrance examinations that a girl from a small-town high school or an ordinary private school can hardly compete. Only if her record is taken into account has she an equal chance with the rest. Radcliffe has tried to reach this girl and to get a certain geographical variety by admitting without examination any student whose high-school rating has put her among the top one-seventh of the girls of her class. Harvard has adopted the same system and the results in both cases are said to be satisfying. President MacCracken of Vassar believes that no system is good which shuts out the earnest, ambitious student who is at the same time dull; he believes that such a person, trained and educated, may be of high use to the world. President Neilson says flatly that much more is expected in the examinations of a girl from a successful preparatory school than of the graduate of a small Oklahoma high school—and they all say they want the Oklahoma girl. And these college heads insist that a single condition should not disqualify a girl who may be more able—in some directions at least—than the steady, all-around passer of examinations; she may be

first-rate "college material" even if she has a hard time with Latin prose. The personal interview is looked upon as a most valuable method of determining those more subtle variations of character and personality and purpose that no examination will reveal.

But in spite of the flexibility so generally insisted on, variety in the student body is hard to achieve. Admission must be competitive and some standards must be set up. Every new test shuts out some different and possibly desirable group of applicants. Those in use are quite generally objected to by certain secondary-school principals. The small-town high school is getting away from the rigid Latin-mathematics-science-English type of education; it is becoming more "practical" if not vocational. And now that its graduates can no longer enter the leading women's colleges on certificate, it must either prepare them for examinations or send them to their State universities. In vast numbers they are following the latter course; a minor revolution is in progress against examinations and the big women's colleges. In view of the congestion of these Eastern ports of learning this is not apparently undesirable; but the result is disastrous if social as well as geographical variety is wanted. Vassar, for instance, has become predominantly a private-school college. Not more than 20 per cent of its students are public-high-school graduates. Its recent increase in tuition—from \$800 to \$1,000—will probably make matters worse, even though the plan is to use a quarter of the added income for scholarships. While the proportions vary, every college is faced with a similar loss of its public-school graduates.

Another group that objects to the present entrance system is found among the heads of the modern "experimental" schools such as the Lincoln School in New York, the Francis Parker School in Chicago, the Moraine Park in Dayton, Ohio. Such schools get, and turn out, interesting students—but few of these students, without extra cramming, can face the subjects or the methods demanded by the college entrance board; and the schools are naturally unwilling to pervert honest education to the lesser ends of passing college board examinations. A hopeful gesture has been made in the direction of meeting this situation. Committees on admission of the women's colleges have been given the authority to "make concessions" to applicants from experimental schools; and, President MacCracken reports, "this authority is occasionally, though perhaps somewhat timidly, exercised."

So the women's college faces its dilemma. It must keep out thousands of girls; but it must keep out the right ones. It first sets higher academic standards. This is easy and obvious. Then, because it does not want mere grinds or the graduates of a few highly developed schools of preparation, it modifies and balances these requirements with others; it takes account of the girl's standing in the school, the type and standing of the school itself, the girl's character, and if possible her personality. It finds out all it can and then it asks, Is this girl good college material? If she is, and if the college has room for her, she is admitted.

"Good college material" is a phrase in universal use; subtle tests are devised to determine it; clever traps are set to catch it. Does it mean the same thing to all college presidents and chairmen of committees on admission? Has it any meaning at all? Some testimony on this subject will be brought together in another article.

In the Driftway

ABOUT four and a half centuries ago the son of a Genoese woolcomber was attempting to persuade a king or some other man of means to fit out for him a fleet in which he could sail to India in a direction diametrically opposed to the common route. When he was past middle life he secured his fleet of three light vessels; he set sail; he was seventy days upon the sea. The waves washed over the prows, the sailors prayed to return from the imminent edge of the world, strange birds flew over them, and the admiral made false entries in his diary to prove to the poltroon crews that they sailed farther each day than actually they did. When at last they sighted one of the West Indian islands no one knows exactly what was in the admiral's mind. He thought he had found India; he wrote that they gave thanks to God and marveled at the beautiful shore and the red-skinned natives that met them. But that is not the whole story; he had had a vision and the vision had been confirmed. No diary could do justice to the swelling throat and beating pulse that must have greeted the first sight of land. No one can realize them who has not himself seen for the first time a portion of the earth not yet seen by human eyes.

* * * * *

THE DRIFTER is moved to these remarks by the story of the Amundsen expedition, of the two birds that have risen from Spitzbergen Island to find the North Pole. Eight hours to the pole and eight hours back; no sleep, no rest for pilot, mechanic, or navigator throughout the flight; their equipment pared to the barest necessities, which nevertheless include dried food for thirty days per man in case of accident; their clothing especially made to withstand Arctic cold and the cold of the upper air; ice below them and wind above—so the story runs. There is no particular reason why they should go. They are not bringing help to unfortunates marooned at the Pole; they are leaving safety for danger. Like the climbers who every year or so attempt the unfriendly sides of Mt. Everest, they start out without incentive and gain no reward. Why do they do it? Why should the ultimate and unmapped portions of the earth beckon explorers so strongly? The sirens of the legends have disappeared—they have evidently gone to Mt. Everest, to the poles; they have taken wings and lean now from the upper air.

* * * * *

FOR the earth is almost conquered. A few portions of the Arctic and Antarctic, certain miles at the Equator, certain sections of the desert are left. It will not be long before they will be as well charted as New York or London, though perhaps not so densely populated. But when the charts have been made, when the whole surface of the earth has been as exactly plotted as portions of it now are, will adventuring cease? The Drifter has it on the best authority that it will not. Some men, for no apparent reason, will dig underground; others, thanks to the fortunate and timely improvement of the airplane, will take to the air. These persons, the Drifter regrets to state, will probably be among those scientists whom Mr. W. J. Bryan calls dishonest scoundrels. They will attempt strange places under hardship because they are unlike Mr. Bryan and the earth as it is does not satisfy them. Probably also they will not be satisfied with the strange places on or off the earth

when they have found them. It is their nature to be dissatisfied, to follow some distant, absurd, irrational mirage. Mr. Bryan stays safely at home with his Gospel and no doubts; and at the same time a restless Columbus sails west and discovers half a world, or an Amundsen, leaving his sensible fireside, flies due north merely to step out on a piece of ice that he will know for the North Pole.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

America's Stand Against Opium

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Miss Ellen La Motte, in her article in *The Nation* of May 6 on the recent Opium Conference, gives expression to a prevailing American attitude which, in view of our possible participation in future international gatherings, seems to require a reply.

The fundamental fallacy of the American attitude, which led to the withdrawal of our delegation from the Geneva parley and incidentally to sensational front-page publicity at home, is the assumption that true progress can be gained by imposing measures against the will of those who must put them into effect. It is self-evident that any international agreement looking toward social or political reform must be voluntarily accepted by all the countries which will be responsible for carrying out the concrete measures agreed upon; otherwise the agreement will not be worth the paper it is written on. The mere passage of a law, whether it be national or international, is utterly meaningless unless those who are charged with its enforcement are not only willing but ready to effect its enforcement. Unfortunately this principle is too often ignored by those Americans who, in their zeal for immediate reform, look upon law as a short-cut to a desired end.

In regard to the specific points raised by Miss La Motte, may I be permitted to take issue with her statement that the only difference between the American "instructions" and those of the other Powers was that ours were public, while the others were secret. First of all the American "instructions" were never made public. In his final memorandum submitted to the president of the Second Conference at the time of his withdrawal, Mr. Porter, the head of the American delegation, said that "in pursuance of the instructions received from this Government" the American delegation "has no alternative under the terms of the joint resolution . . . other than to withdraw"—an ambiguous statement at best. During the course of the conference Mr. Porter frequently spoke of the congressional resolution, which he said prevented him from signing any agreement which did not fulfil the conditions set forth in the American principles. It is clear that this joint resolution in itself was never really binding, and was of weight only in view of an attack later by the Senate upon a possible treaty resulting from the conference. If Mr. Porter was bound at all, it could only have been by instructions issued by the State Department. Yet no such instructions have ever been made public. Mr. Porter's repeated statements that he was powerless to sign any agreement which did not fulfil virtually all of the points in the American program, however, makes it appear that binding instructions had been issued by the State Department. If in fact no such instructions were issued by the State Department, Mr. Porter's attitude forces us to the conclusion that the American delegation was merely making the most of the joint resolution and using the word "instructions" loosely to force the American program, on the threat of American withdrawal. In either event, further explanation is in order.

As to Miss La Motte's statement that "every nation arrived with a fine batch of instructions equally rigid, equally inelastic, and, like ours, admitting of no compromise," it may be pointed

out that none of these states entered the discussions with a threat to withdraw if *all* of its proposals were not accepted. The difference between the American attitude—whether based on "instructions" or not—and that of the other Powers was this: that the other Powers went to Geneva with certain points reserved, but with full freedom to negotiate and with the unchallenged right, if new evidence was presented, to refer back to their governments for further instructions. On the other hand, the United States went with a program, as interpreted by Mr. Porter, inelastic and admitting of no compromise.

Again Miss La Motte insists: "There are certain things with which you cannot compromise, and principle is one. No wonder we left! It was a proud day when we did! We were defeated, but we went down to defeat with the flag flying." Here is another common American fallacy. Just because you cannot gain complete acceptance of your principles at a single stroke, are your opponents necessarily in league with the forces of evil? Miss La Motte makes a serious, not to say hysterical, charge when she declares that "Lord Cecil came to the conference under orders as binding and as inflexible as those which governed his predecessor, Sir Malcolm Delavigne. And of the same kind—protect the opium interests. . . . We were out to end the opium traffic, and the others were out to uphold it." It is the strange delusion of many people in this country that we are the only moral nation. This delusion, which easily lends itself to exaggeration in international conferences, is one of the principal stumbling-blocks on the road to cooperation and team-work.

While everyone acknowledges that the final opium conventions do not go as far as the American delegation desired, the fact remains that they mark a material advance over the Hague Convention of 1912. These advances may be summarized briefly as follows:

The Drug Convention (resulting from the Second Conference) sets up an elaborate system of import and export certificates or licenses designed to control international trade in all materials and manufactured drugs covered by the convention, so as to eliminate the danger of smuggling. It also provides for extensive publicity regarding the course of international trade through the medium of the Permanent Central Board, and contains numerous other provisions for tightening up the Hague Convention. The Smoking Opium Convention (resulting from the First Conference), in conjunction with the protocols attached to the First and Second Conventions, provides for complete suppression of smoking opium within a definite period (fifteen years), which is to commence when the poppy-growing countries have taken measures to prevent the danger of smuggling from becoming a serious obstacle to the suppression of smoking opium in the territories where it is still permitted. The poppy-growing countries on their part have agreed to carry out their obligations as mentioned above within five years. The League Commission is to decide whether these undertakings have been carried out.

Admitting, as did Mr. Potter in his letter of withdrawal, that the Drug Treaty marks an advance in the control of this traffic, where is our "morality" when we turn our backs on an admitted advance and a new method of international control because we could not get all we demanded?

New York, May 7

RAYMOND B. FOSDICK

Catholics in the Public Schools

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Again I think you have done real service in the fight against discrimination based on racial and religious intolerance by publishing Mr. Pierce's article entitled *May Catholics Teach School?* I wonder, however, if the article would not have done more good if it had also dealt with the facts of discrimination in favor of Catholics in a city like New York, where the Catholic church through itself and its political alliances is very strong. To see on the news-stands of New York your question *May*

Catholics Teach School? is just a little humorous. A somewhat intimate contact with the school system a few years ago made me wonder whether anyone other than a Catholic could teach school or, at any rate, hope for promotion without kowtowing to the Catholic-Tammany control.

I do not mean that discrimination in favor of Catholics is as blatantly exercised as some of the discriminations against them to which Mr. Pierce refers. I do mean that on the whole the Catholic church, by its greater cohesion and better organization, can in the long run exercise a more dangerous clerical influence in the public-school system than do Protestant bigots. Of course, as Mr. Pierce points out, the Catholic ideal is parochial education, but the church does not for that reason by any means neglect the interest of its teachers in the public schools and there is no reason to believe that it will not at a suitable moment renew the struggle for public support for parochial schools.

Our real enemy is bigotry, prejudice, imperialism, irrespectiveness of the qualifying adjective Protestant, Nordic, British, German, or what not.

New York, April 26

NORMAN THOMAS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I suggest to readers of *The Nation* that they obtain "Judges of the Faith; Christian versus Godless Schools" and "Rights of Our Little Ones," two Roman Catholic books very highly indorsed by ecclesiastics of the papal system.

The public schools are set forth as breeders of lawlessness, of anarchy, etc. Why, then, should any Roman Catholic even desire to teach in the public schools? In doing so would the Roman Catholic not become partner in the "crime"? In view of the papal position in our public schools, as set forth in the above books, it is about as consistent for a Roman Catholic to teach in the public school as it would be for a Jewish rabbi to seek to fill the chair of theology in a Presbyterian college.

Washington, D. C., April 27.

JOHN N. QUINN

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Although the discrimination against Catholics and Jews in the public-school systems can be demonstrated in more ways than one, it is still somewhat of an asset to be a Catholic (and sometimes, where politics demands it, even a Jew) in the educational systems of some of the larger cities, where Catholics predominate. I have heard of a department head who selected his assistants from the official list if they bore Irish names—and once a Burns turned out to be a former Bernstein.

Nevertheless, Mr. D. H. Pierce in his article on May Catholics Teach School? in your issue of April 29, 1925, has overshot his mark when he declares:

The Catholic church is making rapid strides in its efforts to educate all children of the faith in parochial institutions. The Catholic Directory of 1904 gives the parochial-school population as 986,088; in 1910 it was 1,237,251; in 1920 it was 1,701,213; in 1924 it is 1,988,376.

This indicates that the parochial-school population has doubled within the last two decades. Such a conclusion is erroneous, for it leaves out of consideration a corresponding although not so rapid an increase in the total Catholic population.

As a matter of fact, and I am changing the dates to divide our data into five-year periods, we find that the number of children attending parochial schools per 1,000 of total Catholic population was as follows (years refer to volumes of Catholic Directory):

1905—82	1920—95
1910—86	1925—109
1915—89	

In other words, the increase in parochial school attendance has only been about 25 per cent, when we consider total population, and not the specter of 100 per cent. But in one respect Mr. Pierce's thesis is borne out: that one-half of that increase has taken place within the last five years.

New York, April 25

LEE STEIN

Our Crazy Postal Rates

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I see that "entire newspapers or magazines when mailed by the public" are now two cents for every two ounces, but "incomplete copies" are a cent and a half for every two ounces. Therefore, if you have to send to a friend a bunch of newspapers weighing seven ounces and a half, which would be eight cents postage, just take the papers apart, put half the pages of each paper in one package and half the pages of each in another package, mark each package "Incomplete Newspapers," put a three-cent stamp on each, and save two cents postage. If not, why not?

Or if it is a seven-and-a-half-ounce magazine, cut out an advertising page advertising something that you are sure does not interest your friend, mark the package "Incomplete copy of the Thingumbob Magazine," and make the postage six cents instead of eight. If not, why not?

Or if that magazine mustn't be mutilated at all, and your friend lives within 150 miles, put into the bundle any rubbish weighing more than one ounce and less than eight. By being made to weigh more than eight ounces the package ceases to come under newspaper rates and becomes parcel post weighing less than a pound, which, within 150 miles, is five cents postage and two cents service charge, saving one cent over the postage you would have paid if the rubbish had been omitted. And there is no why-not, for there is no possible if-not.

But if you can truthfully label the enlarged package "Mailed on Rural Route," then there is no service charge, and the saving of postage by adding the half-pound of rubbish to your package is three cents out of the eight if within 150 miles, two cents up to 300 miles, and one cent up to 600.

Understand, you are free of the service charge if you make the rural-delivery man carry it to the post office for you. But if you carry it to the rural post office in your own Ford and mail it at the post office, you have to pay a two-cent service charge because you relieved the government from doing that much service for you. If not, why not?

Ballard Vale, Mass., May 5

STEVEN T. BYINGTON

A Chance for Letter-Writers

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: For a number of years I have found it interesting, diverting, and culturally advantageous to correspond by letter with intelligent people the world over. But I find it difficult to make contact with satisfactory correspondents. *The Nation* must of necessity reach very largely people who are both intelligent and liberal. Hence I should be delighted if any foreign readers would care to correspond with me on topics of general interest. I am convinced that such exchange of ideas promotes both individual culture and international amity. It might well be supplemented with an exchange of periodicals. Perhaps other American or foreign readers feel as I do. If so they may communicate with me—*sending a stamp*—and I shall seek to put them in touch with each other.

Beltsville, Maryland, May 8

T. SWANN HARDING

The Llano Colony's Loss

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Llano Cooperative Colony, after five years of struggle, sustained a heavy blow on the evening of April 14 when the new machinery building was completely destroyed by fire, with a loss of approximately \$100,000. It must be replaced, and our treasury has been entirely depleted.

If you are interested in any phase of what we are doing and attempting to do, now is the time to help.

Newllano, Louisiana, April 30

GEORGE T. PICKETT

Books, Music, and Plays

Out of Singing Days

By CLEMENT WOOD

I

Break out in fire, my hill, at autumn's calling;
Badge the blue sky with ecstasies of flame.
The leaves are falling, as the days are falling,
And you are neither apt to die, nor tame
To take the waning sunlight and the chill
In meek abandonment of lowly brown.
Mint gold and red gold in the sky, until
Your haughty banners swirl superbly down.
Your grass has burnt to purple, and your low
Persistent shrubs lift bleeding hearts in air;
Filletts of fire cling to your trees, and glow
In conquering agony; and everywhere
A gross red laugh indifferent to death,
Echoing the hot plea that burns my breath.

II

Cue me, O voices whispering at my ear,
In reach, but out of grasp: voices of stones
Unsung since men shaped them for arrow and spear,
Unsung since first they cooled as the earth's bones;
Voices of scentless flowers; voices of grass
And vine and tongueless sky-aspiring tree;
Of beasts that stumble, and great wings that pass
Silently deathward, but for song from me.
Cue me, men wrenched by bitter useless pang,
And no less men made wordless by white bliss;
And O you vaster truths and powers, that clang
Your shields softly beside me, grant me this:
To read your silence, and to choral still
Your slow-unveiling, all-directing will.

III

What is a poet but a tiny flaw
Within the massive silent wall of things?
A trickle of thin beauty, misty law,
Escaped from their majestic prisonings?
Harmonies heaven-swelling, wherein we dwell,
Can only seep, a lessening, broken stream,
As dim as ocean-echoes in a shell,
As faint as an almost forgotten dream.
We are dumb enough, God knows; but life is dumber,
Only the rare dull echo of sweet noise,
A desert of winter, with an hour of summer,
A desert of pain, with a far cloud of joys
Mocking our bitter thirst. Then sing, faint breath,
Though nothing heed you but the ears of death.

IV

Sounds sing about me, like a great and glorious
Cloud of swift swallows; like a shower of leaves
Loosed in a tempest; ribald and uproarious
Snatches of catches; a dull tone that grieves
In the wrung heart; sounds like the hot stars chanting,
And the low dust tittering scorn at a tread;
The agony of wrenched creation panting,
The deep and somber music of the dead.
Sounds sing about me—fugitive and mocking;
And when I pen them in these scrawls of black,
They leap away, with laughter black and shocking,
And I can find no voice to call them back.
And I have found now what it means to die—
To be held dumb, when the soul breaks for a cry.

The First of Tragic Poets

Æschylean Tragedy. By Herbert Weir Smyth. University of California Press. \$3.50.

THE Eliot Professor of Greek Literature is known at Harvard University as a philologist; in his published works he has revived antiquity through investigations into Greek grammar, Greek dialects, and the like. As a visiting lecturer in California he shows himself a philologist of the broader sort; his command of details and perspective, his command of life, enables him to relive for us the life of a great poet who is for all time. The volume before us is a learned and popular book of the right kind, done by a scholar; it is such a work as we expect from the best French and German authorities, and now are to expect less seldom than before from the keenest scholars in America and England. It is a book to delight the hovering spirit of Gildersleeve, which warns America that there must be no divorce of literary study and linguistics.

The style and method are those of a man who handles his learning with an easy touch. He is vivacious and sparkling. He scatters allusion rather freely, yet with telling effect. Sundry oral digressions, of humorous intent, could have been omitted from the printed book to the advantage of the reader; but we may condone the excrescences of a large vitality that has formed the lectures into a moving series.

A sane introductory chapter fights shy of strange dramatic origins which have been read into Æschylus by modern anthropology; our author wisely prefers to build upon the cautious remarks of Aristotle concerning the rise of the ancient drama. Like Aristotle, he is both industrious and select in his reading; and though he has flung a net into modern as well as ancient literature and criticism for whatever may illuminate his subject, he begins and ends with the tragedies of Æschylus as they stand. He writes with his eye on the object. The second chapter takes up the earliest extant Greek drama, "The Suppliants" of this poet; the next three discuss in order "The Persians," "Prometheus," and "The Seven Against Thebes." The last three are severally devoted to the parts of that Orestean trilogy which was the crowning effort of a long artistic career. Judicious treatment throughout is accorded to our scanty evidence on the lost works of a prolific author who in the forty years between young manhood and age composed perhaps ninety tragedies and satyric dramas.

When the details are assembled there stands forth the living figure of an artist, endowed with a noble poetic energy, who grew in dramatic wisdom to the end. Is he in the main to be classed with Aristotle's "enthusiastic" poets, while Sophocles falls among the "plastic" or consciously mimetic dramatists? Sophocles himself may have said that Æschylus "did right, not knowing why." Yet sheer elemental genius could not exhibit fourscore and seven plays in the Attic competitions without a gain in conscious art for the final trilogy. Professor Smyth shows that Æschylus did learn, all along, and not only from earlier competitors like Choerilus and Phrynichus but in the end from Sophocles. We infer as much from reading Aristotle in conjunction with the plays. A deliberate innovator, Æschylus improved upon the work of others; and he later adopted Sophocles's innovation of a third actor, as in the "Agamemnon."

Professor Smyth is at once conservative and bold when dealing with modern hypotheses in Æschylean criticism proper. Against Verrall he presents the welcome theory of "double time" in the "Agamemnon"—a device well-known to the student of Shakespeare, and one that has been used by epic and dramatic poets from Homer down. The lapse of time outside of the story, and before the opening of the action, is of small concern to the audience. But ways and means of retarding and speeding the action itself are very important; there must be rushing and suspense alike; the author cannot effect either rapidity or delay without suggesting both, and each by contrast gives the other its pace.

Yet I believe that Professor Smyth might have learned more, not from but through Verrall, and again with the help of ancient principles. Of the marvelous racing beacon-fires described by Clytemnestra her Watchman has seen but one; and this one, stationary, doubtless was visible to the audience, as it is to the Chorus. If the wily, fierce, inventive heroine lies about the rest, Æschylus has done the trick in the Homeric way, and by the method of fallacy that is later recommended in the "Poetics" of Aristotle, chapter 24. Even so, the Chorus is skeptical; they know the lady and the gossip, these doubting old men.

Holding to the drama as it stands—distinguishing, for example, between the delineation of Agamemnon in Æschylus and that in Homer—our interpreter still has not utterly freed himself from a vice of the traditional commentators. It is hard, but imperative, to make antecedent events as they are discussed at length in the play subordinate to the deeds and motives of the instant that is represented, for the motive of the speaking agent warps or colors every statement of alleged fact in the past, every citation of former wrongs. Thus each particular reference to the death of Iphigenia at the behest of Agamemnon must be studied as a speech of some individual person, or of the Chorus, occurring within the action, but relating to an event that happened long before it. The lovely Cassandra sitting in the chariot, while near her stands a wicked and hence all the more vindictive wife; the effrontery of Agamemnon in bringing Cassandra to his home—these are present facts, obvious as the single beacon, and, for the spectators, needing no great elaboration in words. Professor Smyth makes too little of the irritating presence of Cassandra, the rival, as an incentive to the murder of both her and Agamemnon by his adulterous wife. The average reader makes far too little of it, for lack of a Greek sensitiveness to the decorum of Greek family life. One should compare the home-coming of Odysseus, unattended, to relieve a faithful Penelope from unwelcome suitors, with the home-coming of the faithless Agamemnon to the brazen Clytemnestra and her sly Ægisthus lurking in the background. One should visualize the situation of Agamemnon and Cassandra, Clytemnestra and Ægisthus, as this quadrangle would appear in tomorrow's journal. Æschylus is true to life—yet with what reserve has he depicted the cold, hard sparring between wife and husband when they meet!

The forebodings of the luckless Cassandra must also be interpreted in character, and in relation to the actual events of the drama. A large part of what she says deals with matters that are known to all. Another part reveals her feminine intuition. While silent in the car, this gifted creature has read her loquacious enemy from the surface to the heart; and her own solicitude for Agamemnon should receive very careful scrutiny. As for her direct prevision of death, if no one else believes her, it is highly important for the action that she believes herself. She is a fatalist: "The day is come; small gain for me in flight." Of her own volition she goes indoors to be slain.

On this question of fate in the ancient drama Professor Smyth is well worth reading; yet he does not say in full what we keenly wish to hear: that Æschylus and Sophocles—and Homer—are not fatalists; that they devise for the persons of tragedy fatalistic utterances (as also utterances on free will); that men and women who make fate an excuse are prone to such violence as is suitable in tragedy; that every speech in a well-conceived drama must be interpreted in character; but that Euripides does inartistically mingle his own sentiments in his plays, and tends toward the fatalism of Seneca and the Romans which so often reappears on the modern stage and in the modern novel.

"In Greek tragedy the contest of the hero is primarily with outside forces" (p. 147). Is not the struggle of Agamemnon primarily with Clytemnestra? Is it not a domestic strug-

gle? "Force," as used by Professor Smyth, and not by him alone, is a modern concept, taken from the science of matter, and intruded upon dramatic criticism. Aristotle rightly thinks of the tragic drama not as a struggle between a man and a "force" but as an action of human beings that do and suffer, meditate violence, carry out or reverse their intent. "Fate" is a Roman notion; and how much more like a dramatic agent is its Greek counterpart! But, strictly considered, Latin *fatum* means "something said," and *fata* "things said." When people believe them, what an influence "things said" can exert upon human action! As for "Force," there is a personage of that name in the "Prometheus"; Force and Strength do come to grips, in the proper dramatic way, with the hero.

In dealing with alleged Greek fatalism, it is a good plan to ask oneself what Odysseus would do were he placed in the situation of Antigone, Cassandra, or Agamemnon. If confined in a tomb, like Antigone, would he hang himself ere the food was exhausted? Had she waited, she would have been saved. How did he act when he was trapped in the cave of the Cyclops? And, with the fear of death upon him, would he, like Cassandra, cry "Small gain for me in flight!" and pass indoors to be slain? Agamemnon debates, not whether he shall go in or remain without, but whether he shall go in on a purple carpet. Odysseus slips home in disguise, partly in order to observe the behavior of his wife. It is not for nothing that the return of Agamemnon is sketched as a parallel but contrasting *Nostos* at the opening of the "Odyssey."

The reviewer naturally professes no such acquaintance with Æschylus as might vie with the knowledge of ancient tragedy displayed in this excellent book. Yet we may question the emphasis of treatment with regard to one more episode in the "Oresteia." If our author has grasped the dramatic value of the trial-scene in "The Eumenides," he lays undue stress upon its local and temporal interest in connection with the Court of the Areopagus. When the antiquary dilates upon this external, contemporaneous interest, the enduring quality of that tremendous dramatic contest tends to slip from our view.

The author plans to include these lectures in "a further study of the mind and art of Æschylus"; we have high hopes for this future enterprise. There are slight defects—little touches of patavinity—in the diction and in the printing, some attributable, like the French of Chaucer's Prioress, to one school, and some to another. We do not relish the employment of the verbal forms of "voice" and "voicing" in the sense of dramatic utterance, nor of "tragedians" for tragic poets, nor of "protagonist" for chief agent in a drama. Surely in a book on Æschylus "protagonist" should be restricted to the meaning of "first actor."

All told, however, this fine, sound, lively book is one which it does a reviewer's heart good to commend. If the volume is not freely read the fault will lie with the reading public.

LANE COOPER

The Stream of Consciousness

Mrs. Dalloway. By Virginia Woolf. Harcourt, Brace and Company. \$2.50.

MRS. WOOLF is a sort of decorous James Joyce. Her method, which consists in recording the stream of consciousness as it flows through the minds of her characters, is essentially the same as his, and her new novel, dealing like "Ulysses" with the events of a single day, tells such story as it has to tell through the medium of the recollections which stir vaguely in the memories of her people. Mrs. Woolf prefers to choose her characters from among those who, owning an allegiance to good society, have had both their manners and their thoughts disciplined by its conventions, and she discovers none of those grotesque monsters whom Mr. Joyce finds inhabiting the jungles of the mind; but this difference, which is merely a difference in temperament and experience, has nothing to do

with the method, which is the same in both cases and consists essentially in the attempt to catch life upon the wing, to discard the conventional patterns of story-telling, and to deal with the ultimate stuff of consciousness.

Acts have thoughts behind them, even spoken words have been selected and arranged, so that to describe either is to describe something at least one step removed from the soul; but those unuttered monologues which constitute the bulk of both "Ulysses" and "Mrs. Dalloway" are intended to represent consciousness as it first comes into being, bubbling up from the brain which generates it and constituting the stuff of which character is made. One may go, if one likes, a little deeper and discuss, by the psychoanalytic method, the origin of moods and desires; but to do that is to pass beyond consciousness, for consciousness begins at the point at which Mr. Joyce and Mrs. Woolf describe it. Miscellaneous, vague, and chaotic, composed of memories, moods, sensations, and desires mingled helter-skelter with things tragic and comic, trivial and important treading upon the heels of one another, the stream goes continuously on from the moment we wake until it trails off, fainter and fainter, into slumber or death. From this fast-moving current we snatch bits here and there to fashion into words or to clutch at as resolutions, and by these we are judged; but the real "I" is the ever-flowing stream known only to ourselves, and it is with this "I" that Mrs. Woolf deals.

It is impossible to say to what extent the correspondence which exists between the moods and methods of fiction and the moods and methods of contemporary science and philosophy is the result of an influence of the latter upon the former and to what extent it is the result merely of a similar development in the minds of workers in different fields; but the correspondence is real. The older method of writing novels was based upon a tacit acceptance of the premise of the older psychology, which conceived of the ego as though it were a unified, self-consistent thing whose main features could be described as one describes the features of something static like a landscape or a building; the modern method corresponds to the conception associated with William James, which dismisses the unified ego as a figment of the imagination and substitutes the stream of consciousness as the ultimate fact about a human being. And in so doing it comes closer not only to a modern scientific conception but to a modern mood also, for it seems by analogy to dispense with the necessity of finding in the sequence of events a logic which represents the working out of a plan or a meaning in existence. Life, instead of being the orderly development of a divine purpose in which it is necessary for the artist to discover that hidden significance and harmony which seems to most moderns so difficult to find, becomes itself only an unending stream of events whose sequence is casual and whose only significance lies in its fertility and its contrasts. Human beings cease to have hidden within them that unifying entity called the soul, and as it disappears there disappears with it the soul of the universe. There remains only the stream of consciousness and, parallel with it, the stream of events.

It is the distinction of Mrs. Woolf that, unlike most of those who employ her method, she applies it to the presentation of persons who are leading orderly lives, and that she makes it serve the purpose of realizing more intimately the charm of quiet people. The day which she has chosen to present is the day upon which her central character meets after many years the old lover whom she did not marry, and in the course of the three hundred pages which record this day nothing happens except that the reader is brought into intimate contact with a group of people and made to participate in their consciousness. Mrs. Dalloway is not, by ordinary standards, a remarkable person. She has played no important role in life and she is not consciously a philosopher, but it is obvious that as she has moved through the world she has achieved a certain serenity in the midst of the eternal flux; and this, so I think, Mrs. Woolf means us to guess to be the secret of her charm. A little withdrawn, a little lacking, perhaps, in passion, she nevertheless

manages to maintain a poise as the stream flows by and to create by her decorum and *savoir faire* a semblance of orderliness in a disordered world. As she watches the changing spectacle of the London streets, talks with her former lover, or greets with formal ease the arrival of her guests, she seems to assure those who come near her that life, even though it have neither harmony nor meaning, may yet be lived with a certain comeliness if one does not ask too much of it; and thus Mrs. Woolf reinvestigates a very old sort of loveliness. The method which she uses is the newest and most radical, but the charm which she exploits—the charm of decorum and resignation—is the most conservative thing in the world.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Beyond Patriotism

Patriotism Is Not Enough. By John Haynes Holmes. Greenberg, Publisher, Inc. \$2.

THIS very stimulating volume deals with a question which is one of life and death for Western civilization. Unless the peoples of the various nations open their eyes to the iniquities which are now being carried on by governments under the cloak of patriotism they are sure to find themselves engaged in another suicidal war. Mr. Holmes is careful, however, not to make a sweeping indictment of patriotism. He recognizes the tremendous social significance of love of country and the willingness of the individual to die in defense of his home. The real menace is to be found not in love of country but in the doctrine of absolute allegiance to the nation—that is, to the political organization of one's country. The danger at this point is imminent and stupendous. So long as my-country-right-or-wrong prevails and political leaders know that by an appeal to patriotic shibboleths they can gain support for their provocative and imperialistic policies, so long will the peace of the world be imperiled. The need of the hour is for patriots who will be more alert in discerning the vicious practices of their leaders and who will refuse under all circumstances to support acts of national aggression.

Furthermore, there is an urgent need for greater intelligence in selecting effective ways and means of showing love for country and of promoting its ideals. Hitherto patriotism has been far too closely identified with war. It has been assumed that citizens are under absolute obligation to support their government in waging war, no matter what the aims of the struggle may be. True enough, modern governments disguise their aggressive ambitions and seek to convince their citizens that the war is being waged in self-defense or on behalf of some great ideal; for example, the Allied leaders in the World War publicly assured their people that the war was being waged on idealistic grounds at the same moment that they were negotiating a series of sordid secret treaties providing for the division of vast areas of the earth among themselves. Mr. Holmes is quite right in saying that there is little hope of true patriotism finding expression so long as war is the normal and legal means of settling disputes between nations and so long as the theory of national sovereignty is maintained. The author therefore places great emphasis upon the importance of the outlawry-of-war movement and the necessity of education concerning the relationship of nationalism to internationalism. The task before this generation is the age-long one of substituting law and orderly processes of justice for anarchy and violence, and the widening of the sphere of one's loyalties. Mr. Holmes believes that it is possible to outlaw war along with the duel and individual violence, and to raise patriotism one stage higher so as to make it include not only love of family, city, state, and nation but genuine loyalty to the interests of all mankind. Patriotism is not enough. Above all nations is humanity. This book deserves careful reading by ministers, teachers, and all others who have any responsibility for our educational processes.

KIRBY PAGE

Talkers

Getting a Laugh, and Other Essays. By Charles H. Grandgent. Harvard University Press. \$2.

Unmailed Letters. By Joseph H. Odell. E. P. Dutton and Company. \$2.50.

IT is pleasant and reassuring to know that we have among our social assets the scholarship, and sophistication, and the leisure of spirit out of which Mr. Grandgent and Mr. Odell write. Their books are marked by the grace and the sensitiveness that come with the academic tradition at its best. But talk is one thing, and book-making another.

"For my digressions I make no apology, discursiveness being a privilege of the essay," says Mr. Grandgent—a remark which he might have used equally well to introduce almost any of the paragraphs in any of the seven papers of his volume. But even the protean essay may perish by too great an extension of its privileges; the result in this case is aptly described by the phrase which Mr. Grandgent himself applies to his work in his preface—"rambling meditations." These meditations are almost always interesting; they are embellished with amusing anecdotes; they allude suggestively to the plays and the books of the day, and of preceding days. But, on the whole, they are pretty beads strung on threads so slender that they threaten to break before the end of the thirty pages devoted almost uniformly to each paper. The exceptions occur when Mr. Grandgent writes of linguistics in syllables intelligible even to the comparatively unlettered.

There is more than a tinge of condescension in these pieces "which bear witness to occasional hours of relaxation in the busy life" of a real scholar. Those who are not scholars may well feel grateful at finding cultivation brought to bear upon their fleeting interests. But when the examination is as casual as the subject, let the result be registered in one of our excellently casual mediums—the newspaper "colyum" or the section of a magazine which is given over to commentaries as fleeting as they are refreshing—and not strung together as a synthetic essay. That form, to my mind, demands that even a slight subject, lightly treated, be permitted to abandon itself to all the little that is in it; an obvious comparison is that of Mr. Grandgent's paper On Seeing People Off with the essay of the same name by Max Beerbohm.

Mr. Odell does not try to give his pieces even so general a title as, for example, the "Prejudices (and Hills)" which cloaks Mr. Grandgent's thoughts on a number of things. The severely numbered short subdivisions of "Unmailed Letters" have by contrast each the virtue of unity of mood; in all they build up a clear sense of the personality of the writer. Some of them take their point of departure from the winter countryside to which the author has been exiled by ill-health; others are recollections of his past which crowd forward during this unaccustomed leisure, or messages from the friends to whom these unmailed replies were written. One is glad that they followed this indirect route to those friends.

MARY ROSS

New Women for Old

Women and Leisure: A Study in Social Waste. By Lorine Pruette. E. P. Dutton and Company. \$3.

BOOKS almost without number have dealt with the so-called woman question, and these books constitute the sorriest examples of thinking in the whole realm of sociology. Religious prejudices, sentimentality, purity complexes, and the penetrating power of age-worn mores combine to make most of what is written utterly useless. Even when there is no emotional distortion, the question is perhaps naively traced to the industrial revolution and dismissed with that. Dr. Pruette has avoided nearly all of these faults; this is a volume which

is both illuminating and serviceable. Her discussion of woman's place in this century rests upon both psychological and cultural analysis, and the particular combination of these two makes her contribution of significance.

Dr. Pruette believes that work is a fine thing, and that women have too much leisure. Here the industrial revolution has played its part, taking from the home the many activities which our foremothers performed there. Certain attitudes toward woman and her proper sphere developed in this early period, and then have never changed. Dr. Pruette substantiates this rather effectively by a questionnaire submitted to some 300 men, the sum and substance of whose opinions is that woman's place is in the home. This part of Dr. Pruette's book is perhaps the least novel, although her statement is exceedingly concise and clear.

It is when she considers her problem from the psychological side, rather than from the economic, that she is most original. Here she has taken the query of the cartoonist, "I wonder what a young girl thinks about?", and turned it into a perfectly valid scientific investigation. The maladjustment of women can be understood only partially in terms of the economic factor; there must also be a consideration of the desires and wishes of the women themselves. An extended study of the day-dreams of adolescent girls is utilized to show the inner conflict prevailing today in the minds of young women. Shall it be career or home? Shall it be freedom or submission to the mores? The analysis is illuminating, and furnishes a sound basis for the conclusion that the modern girl is torn between the desire to do something in the outside world (from which she is shut by the codes of the times) and the desire to have a home and family, which ambition precludes at present the possibility of self-expression on any satisfactory scale. Home life today, as Dr. Pruette views it, means for most women a monotonous part-time job and probable dissatisfaction. The fundamental urge to activity becomes stunted or gains expression in the trivialities of the woman from Main Street. Dr. Pruette herself believes that home and career can be combined, "that women are beginning to make this combination; that tomorrow more of them will be making it." At the same time she admits that this is both a hope and a prejudice.

To readers who have wearied of the vagueness of much sociological theorizing Dr. Pruette's study will bring welcome relief. Her conclusions are based on ingeniously utilized statistical data. There is here an honest attempt to make an inductive study of an important social question. Just to the extent that inductive material replaces speculation in social analysis will the barrier of bias and prejudice surrounding most social thinking break down.

MALCOLM M. WILLEY

Nitti in Switzerland

They Make a Desert. By Francesco Nitti. Translated from the Italian by F. Brittain. London: Dent and Sons. 10/6.

FROM the vales of Switzerland the former Premier of Italy continues to thunder against the baleful Treaty of Versailles. His voice must reach a large portion of mankind, but while Italy showers decorations on distant men who have served her very little she turns her eyes away from one of the greatest of her living sons.

The patriotism of Signor Nitti, who reorganized his country's affairs after disastrous Caporetto, is beyond question. The foe of German militarism, however, has become the implacable foe of Gallic militarism. Compelled to sign at Versailles what his predecessors had prepared, he now describes what that document did to mutilate innumerable hoary boundaries, to create a new and greater imperialism, and to enslave populations. That Germany alone brought on the war he dismisses as a fable. He begins with the entry of America into the war, and goes on

to ascribe most of the calamities of the peace to Wilson's going to Paris. "The advantages of his exceptional position were canceled at a stroke," since he had to argue face to face with statesmen infinitely more familiar with the scene, amid stifling pro-French propaganda.

The cruelty of the peace terms he demonstrates by comparing them with the mildness of the settlements between Japan and Russia, between Great Britain and the Boers, between Europe and France in 1815, and between Prussia and France in 1871. Poincaré he deems the indefatigable agent of imperialism before and after the war. The plans of the great French ironmasters for control of coal and iron he details in the secret Franco-Russian Treaty of 1917 and in every succeeding step, including the invasion of the Ruhr. "The French iron trade during the war, and more particularly during the peace negotiations, had its most able men either in the Government or in close contact with it. One of these personally drew up the most unfortunate clauses of the treaty." It was not enough, he argues, that the French people should be deceived as to war origins. It was necessary to deceive them also as to defeated Germany's capacity to pay. He accuses Poincaré of deliberately propagating the idea that Germany not only could pay all the war costs, including pensions, but could permanently yield such additional sums as would make taxes lighter in France than they were before the war. Hence the invasion of the Ruhr.

Signor Nitti believes all Europe to be on the verge of political and economic ruin. The Dawes Plan he approves merely as a well-designed palliative. "Europe does not yet dare to face the problem of her existence." He recognizes as natural, and yet deplores, the American attitude toward Europe. Against the Reparation Commission he seems never to have too much to say. They are "stupid men directed by clever men" and their organization is a "docile organ of every kind of abuse."

The book is written with first-hand knowledge of the populations, the historical data, and the great actors involved, and generally it is free from the bitterness which might be felt by a harshly treated patriot not in sympathy with his present Government or with the present dominant Powers in Europe.

FREDERICK BAUSMAN

Books in Brief

The Black Soul. By Liam O'Flaherty. Boni and Liveright. \$2.50.

Here is the tragedy of the emotional life, even though the book ends happily. Here is a man who lives, as most do, in the womb of the seasons. First winter comes with her cruelty and makes him tingle to conquer. Then spring touches his love for Little Mary, the wife of Red John, a peasant. There are miles of green wet sod, fields of white sheep, women hurrying home with buckets of milk. Summer comes rich and ripe. The struggle in the hero to separate himself from nature and become an independent being is ready to break. He sees into Little Mary for the first time and his conflict dissolves in a moment of selflessness. Autumn snarls, and the man turns and faces his fear of life, of action, of love. He disentangles himself enough to look at his fears and they wither, fall away. Now that he no longer fears nature, he succumbs to her and is set free. One is blinded by this book, made helpless, beaten by wind and water, but with the mind still pricking vividly. It is a ripe piece of work, splendidly extravagant, and cruelly honest.

Mockbeggar. By Laurence W. Meynell. D. Appleton and Company. \$2.

"Mockbeggar," in catching a group of modern English people and turning them inside out, reveals this present moment of violent disbelief in life which is expressed with the same persistence our ancestors used in pouring out their absolute faith. Says Vivian: "Life is not a loom. It is a lemon." The

novel is bursting with such puerile cynicism; it is stiff with repetitious mannerisms and banal philosophizing about life and furniture. Its people have no inhibitions in speaking about Life, no apologies for using it constantly as the core of conversation, no embarrassment, or mercy. The book is at best a series of brilliant fragments, charmingly free from narrative interest, and dependent upon the interaction of characters who build up situations with their words, their clothes, the menu.

Tongues of Fire. By Algernon Blackwood. E. P. Dutton and Company. \$2.

So many authors, once seared by the divine flame, spend their later years in laboriously collecting ashes. The supernatural story is a thing of infinite possibility; and yet an author cannot invent more than he can invent. Often he merely imitates his own former inventions. Of late years Mr. Blackwood has argued his theories rather than given his dramas. He is trying to prove the fact of the supernal. His latest collection has all of his pleasant charm and none of his former radiant distinction colored with gloom and terror. Not one of the sketches catches the genius of *The Willows* or *Ancient Sorceries* and none the grace of *Jimbo*. Here are general effects rather than lightning bolts from the dark gloom of night haunted with a terrible mystery.

The Romance of New Russia. By Magdeleine Marx. Thomas Seltzer. \$2.

Magdeleine Marx does for the yearning Communists of France what the duchess used to do for servant girls. With a difference. The duchess invented things that never were on land or sea to fulfil impossible wishes. Magdeleine's trick is all a matter of rose-colored glasses, of which one lens is honestly the temperament of an ardent young woman of the Clarté group in sympathy with new social ideals, and the other lens is a tendency to flattery with a trowel. However, the book is lively reading, and despite the fact that too often the author has erased the illuminating lines of life in her eagerness to please she has produced excellent portraits of individual Russians—of Zorin the propagandist, of Mme Kollontay, of the Countess Z, more abysmally intent on romanticizing the good old days than Magdeleine is on the new. Then there is a chapter of dialogue between priests which does more than a dozen heavy articles to explain what the church struggle in Russia is all about. And there is always so lovely and breathless a quality about this tour of Russia it would be graceless, with a strawberry-tart in hand, to complain that Magdeleine serves so little bread of scientific report.

Erasmus in Praise of Folly. Edited by Horace Bridges. Pascal Covici. \$7.50.

The Yale student who said that Harvard men were individually fine fellows but collectively a pack of nincompoops exactly hit upon the method of the successful satirist. For men dislike being called fools personally but they love to be called fools in the mass. Few books have been more popular than that in which a Dutch wit proclaimed that Folly made the world go round. Of this book there have been, in four centuries, 249 editions, of which 24 are in English. Mr. Bridges has now given us, in a handsome new edition, a revision of an earlier translation, together with a delicate and thoughtful essay of appreciation by way of preface. The illustrations, in three rather startlingly various styles, exhibit the contemporary art of Holbein contrasted with Mr. Angarola's conception of the period and with drawings in the modern style by Mr. Gene Markey.

A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. By Ernest Weekley. E. P. Dutton and Company. \$3.

An abridgment of Mr. Weekley's larger work of 1921. Space has been saved not by reducing the number of words but by condensing the explanations.

Music

Swedish Impressions

THOSE New York critics who would rest their ears from the cacophonies and "messages" of the future—a "future" that for them is ever present—should come to Sweden. Here they will not have to wrestle with the merits or demerits of Stravinsky, for instance, as they have had to do this past winter, for the simple reason that there is no occasion to do so. Stravinsky has not even scratched the surface of Sweden's musical life, much less become a problem. As for that other iconoclast, Arnold Schönberg, he seems to have left only a mark or two, though somewhat invisible, on this surface. At least I was told by Hilding Rosenberg, who is considered by musicians like Stenhammar to be the leader of Sweden's youthful "futurists," that some of his group have been influenced by the Viennese composer and some by the "modern French" school. Rosenberg himself confessed to the latter, and also to the influence of Wilhelm Stenhammar. But when, as it happened, I heard Stenhammar's "Symphonic cantata for solo quartet and chorus" follow Rosenberg's "Sinfonia da Chiesa" on the same symphonic program—it was the beginning of Stockholm's Swedish week in music—there seemed little relationship between the two. Stenhammar belongs to a much older generation—a generation strongly submissive to the German classicists, and acknowledging no other outside rule except that of Sibelius. Stenhammar himself is very popular as a composer, and undoubtedly the most popular pianist in Sweden. In addition he directed for some years a symphony orchestra in Göteborg, and is, at present, a conductor at the Royal Opera in Stockholm. But his tastes and tendencies are extremely reactionary; so that by the younger generation he is admired chiefly as "the most cultivated musician in Sweden."

Rosenberg, too, is reactionary in the sense that he has taken as his musical creed the pure, classical form. The only danger in such a creed, judging by his "Sinfonia da Chiesa," is that this form is sometimes achieved at the price of content. In this work, at least, the content showed a talent more imitative than original. And having found in it nothing more startlingly modern than Debussy and a hint of Rimsky-Korsakoff, I went back to my country retreat feeling that, if Rosenberg was indeed the leader of Sweden's "futurists," I was not missing any world-shaking tonal revolutions by deserting Stockholm.

Personally, Rosenberg is a charming and intelligent musician. And although he claims to be an internationalist I learned more from him about Sweden's struggle for a national musical consciousness than from Stenhammar, who has seen so many phases of this struggle, or from Ture Rangström, who is an active participant. Both these men disclaimed any active association with their fellow-composers or any association of their fellow-composers with one another, and seemed rather proud of the fact. How far this is true I do not know. One finds something of this self-isolation now in England, with individual as well as national results. Sweden, however, unlike England, has no sophisticated traditions from Elizabethan days to fall back on. But she has her folk-tunes, her folk-lore, and her individual natural aspect, and to these we find nationalistic composers, such as Rangström and Kurt Atterberg, turning for inspiration. Rangström and Atterberg, indeed, proved to be the most significant composers of "Swedish week." Each had an opera presented at the Royal Opera; and it perhaps speaks well for the Swedish public that Atterberg's work, "Bäckahästen," which was having its initial hearing, drew the most brilliant audience of the season and sold out the house.

I was sorry that the Peterson-Berger opera was taken off the schedule, for Peterson-Berger stands high among Swedish composers. I also regretted missing the performance of a new symphony by Hugo Alfvén, who is equally distinguished. But I had the good fortune to hear Alfvén conduct the Orpheus

Society at Upsala—a male students' chorus which he has headed for fifteen years. They sang only students' songs, it is true; but Alfvén conducted with a musical feeling and finish that proclaimed him a musician of high rank.

The most magnificent male chorus, however, I can ever remember hearing, and one which I would recommend to any enterprising manager in America, was that of the great Finnish choral society, Laulu-Mihiet. This organization, which has been in existence only ten years, gave, under its leader, Väinö Rautavaara, one of the most beautiful concerts I have heard in years. The program of Swedish-Finnish composers was so exquisite from beginning to end that one could not but realize how richly musical this little-known Finland is, where Sibelius is but the worthy leader of an equally worthy group. For the rest, one can only say that the singing was on a par with the music itself. The basses had that marvelous depth and organlike quality that one usually hears only in the Russians; while the tenors were singularly free from throatiness. All were most beautifully balanced, and musically they were irreproachable as well as unapproachable.

This chorus, too, I heard in Upsala; for the best that comes to Stockholm seems to find its way to this small but famous old university town. Only recently, indeed, I heard the latest sensation in the Swedish musical world—a young Russian violin prodigy named Mischa Weisbord. He showed, indeed, that astounding virtuosity which we have come to associate with the Mischas and Yashas, but he showed also an extraordinary lack of all musical feeling, even for a boy of eighteen. He took the public by storm, however, and as a result he will try his luck soon in America. For even in peaceful, conservative Sweden, where the Viennese waltz, under the baton of Johann Strauss 3rd, still can compete with modern jazz, America looms up as the Promised Land.

HENRIETTA STRAUS

Drama

Galsworthy Escapes Drama

DURING the course of the presentation of Galsworthy's "A Bit o' Love" at the Forty-eighth Street Theater there occurs an incident which may serve to explain the fact that history records the names of no more than a dozen or two of Christians since the sect was founded. In the second act of the piece referred to the hero, a minister who is making an effort to practice the creed he preaches, is patiently submitting to the baiting which a drunken bully is inflicting upon him. Suddenly, however, he loses control of himself, seizes the wretch by the shoulders, and flings him crashing through the window; and the audience, up to this point silent and uncomfortable, breaks into spontaneous applause. In his moment of failure the hero becomes immediately sympathetic because the turning worm and the sudden strength of the weak have the same fundamental appeal as the Cinderella motif; not one person in a thousand is capable of emotionally understanding this momentary triumph as the failure which the author meant it to represent. Muscular Christianity is always popular provided it is sufficiently muscular and not too Christian. It is always easy to enlist any number of people in a crusade to smite the evil-doer, because smiting is good fun and might just as well as not be done in a righteous cause; but "Resist not evil" is an injunction too hard for human nature, and the really popular preacher will always be the one who can invent some phrase like Theodore Roosevelt's "Trust God and take your own part," which utterly repudiates the first principle of the creed which it pretends to interpret.

Galsworthy's play is, in the presentation of its moral idea, admirably and unusually consistent, for it makes no compromise between the impulses of human nature and the Christianity which it preaches. The hero, deserted by the wife whom he dearly loved, resolutely refuses to take any

action against her because, though he has no doubt of her wrongdoing, he understands sufficiently the religion of which he is a minister to know that neither vengeance nor resistance is his; and he stands firmly upon this principle against both those who argue that in so doing he is simply encouraging wickedness and those among the simple villagers who believe, like Roosevelt, that Christianity is no adequate substitute for the manliness which knows how to take its own part. But admirable as the play is from this point of view it is, like most of those by the same author, dramatically weak, so that one leaves the theater with more respect for him as a moralist than as an artist. Perhaps because the Christian virtues are not in themselves dramatic, because one simply cannot show for two hours and a half a man who does nothing but stand with folded hands while he is struck upon one physical or spiritual cheek after the other, the play is padded with obviously irrelevant material, like the scene in the inn and the dancing in the barn, until it reaches an impotent conclusion without having in a single incident achieved any clear-cut confrontation of opposing forces. All that is really interesting in the play is the idea, and that might have been stated just as effectively in two hundred words.

Because the author is at bottom a moralist rather than a dramatist he has failed to perceive or to develop the central conflict which the situation he has chosen provides. He has on the one side the stupendous philosophy of Christianity as it is embodied in his hero, but this hero meets no antagonist worthy of the force within him since the muddle-headedness of villagers is obviously too contemptible really to challenge it.

There is only one thing big enough to enter into conflict with Christianity and that is Paganism—the worship of the

joy of life; but though Paganism has its natural representative in the wife who chose to follow passion rather than duty, Galsworthy never uses her. Because he is a moralist and, therefore, interested in one point of view instead of being, as a dramatist should be, interested in two, he cannot possibly write what should have been the great scene of his play, the scene in which the wife, converted by the greatness of her passion to a belief in fulfilment rather than abnegation, confronts her husband's religion with her own. As a result of this inability he loses his play, introducing the wife only for a moment, sentimentalizing her position, and thus renouncing the only conflict which had in it an element of greatness. The husband's refusal to revenge himself might have made a memorable conclusion, the final triumphant gesture being inspired by a faith which had remained unshaken by hers; but this gesture is not in itself a play, and to try to make it one is to mistake, as the author so frequently does, an edifying anecdote for drama. O. P. Heggie gives a very fine performance as the minister; Chrystal Herne as his wife is good in her single brief scene.

An English version of Wedekind's "Erdgeist," now called "The Loves of Lulu" (Ambassador Theater), includes the picturesque Margot Kelly and the handsome Ullrich Haupt in its cast, but it seems more rhetorical and violent than significant. "The Bride Retires" (National Theater) retains in its text a good deal of the rather sentimental and luscious naughtiness of the French farce from which it is taken, but it is acted in so unimpassioned an Anglo-Saxon manner as to convey no other impression than that the players must be respectable family people who have no comprehension of the manners they are portraying or the sentiments they express.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH



THEATRE



THEATRE



THEATRE GUILD PRODUCTIONS

GUILD Theatre, 52nd Street West of Broadway.
Eves., 8:15. Mats. Thurs. and Sat., 2:15

BERNARD SHAW'S famous comedy

CAESAR and CLEOPATRA

with a brilliant cast, including

Lionel Atwill, Helen Hayes, Helen Westley, Albert
Bruning, Schuyler Ladd, Henry Travers, Edmund Eton
and seventy others. Staged by Philip Moeller.

THEY KNEW WHAT THEY WANTED

with RICHARD BENNETT and PAULINE LORD

KLAW West 45th St. Evenings, 8:40.
Matinees Wednesday and Saturday, 2:40

THE GUARDSMAN

GARRICK Theatre, 65 West 35th Street.
Eves., 8:40. Mats. Thurs. and Sat., 2:40

B
T
H
E
R
E
L
A
S
T
R
I
U
M
P
H
S

Holbrook BLINN Judith ANDERSON
in
"THE DOVE"
By Willard Mack

Empire

B'way, 40th St.
Eves. at 8:20
Mats. Wed.
& Sat., 2:20

THE HAREM
with WILLIAM COURTENAY
and distinguished cast

Belasco

W. 44th St.
Eves. at 8:30
Mats. Thurs.
& Sat., 2:30

"LADIES
OF THE
EVENING"

Lyceum

W. 45th St.
Eves. at 8:30
Mats. Thurs.
& Sat., 2:30

52nd St. Theatre, one block west of Broadway. Eves. 8:30 sharp
Mats. Thursday (Popular) and Saturday, 2:30

THE STAGERS INC. Present

ROSMERSHOLM

"One of the essential experiences of the persistent playgoer who ought not let slip this chance to see a rare and memorable play."—*Woolcott, Sun.*



Every Evening (except Monday)
Matinees on Saturday only

Sheridan's Famous Comedy

"The Critic"

Engagement extended up to and including Sunday evening,
June 14. Orchestra, \$1.50. Balcony, \$1.00.

ARTHUR HOPKINS presents

"WHAT PRICE GLORY"

A new Play by Maxwell Anderson and Laurence Stallings

PLYMOUTH THEATRE 45th St. W. of B'way. Eves. 8:30.
Mats. Thursday and Saturday.

See the back cover for announcement of *The Nation's* Summer Book Number and other plans.

When writing to advertisers, please mention The Nation

International Relations Section

The Last Statement of Patriarch Tikhon

IN a statement said to have been written shortly before his death, in the presence of his associates and the dignitaries of the Greek Orthodox Church, Patriarch Tikhon reaffirmed his loyalty to the Soviet Government and called upon his followers to support the Government wholeheartedly. The statement was transmitted to the Moscow *Izvestia* by Metropolitans Peter Krutitsky and Tikhon Uralsky with the request that it be published. It was printed in the Moscow *Izvestia* of April 15. The full text follows:

By the grace of God, the humble Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and of all the Church of Russia.

Beneficence and peace to you from our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

In the years of the great civil strife, by the will of God without which nothing happens in the world, the Russian state came under the control of the Soviet power which assumed a heavy duty—to do away with the gruesome effects of the bloody war and the terrible famine.

After assuming the government of the Russian state the representatives of the Soviet power, in January, 1918, decreed full liberty of belief to all citizens. Thus, the principle of freedom of conscience which was proclaimed by the constitution of the U. S. S. R. insures to all religious congregations, including our Orthodox church, the rights and opportunities to live and to conduct their religious affairs in accordance with the demands of their faith so long as they do not infringe on the public order and the rights of other citizens. And therefore we, in our time, have publicly recognized, in our messages to the archpastors, pastors, and the flock, the new order of things and the Workers' and Peasants' power whose government we have sincerely welcomed.

It is time for all the faithful to understand the Christian viewpoint that "the fates of the peoples are predestined by the Lord" and to accept all that has happened as the expression of the will of God. Without sinning against our faith and church, without changing anything within them, in a word without making any compromises in the field of religion, we must as citizens be sincere in our relations to the Soviet power and to the work of the U. S. S. R. for the general good, adapting the external administration of the life and activities of the church to the new order and condemning every league with the enemies of the Soviet power and the open or secret agitation against it.

Raising our prayers that God may send his blessing on the labor of the peoples which have united their forces in the name of the general good, we call upon all beloved children of the Russian church in these grave times of building up the general welfare of the people to join us in our warm prayer to the Highest that He may send His help to the Workers' and Peasants' Power in its labors for the general welfare. We also call upon the church congregations, and especially upon their executive organs, not to allow any attempts of evil-minded people against the government, not to nurse any hopes for the return of the monarchical order, and to become convinced that the Soviet is the real power of the workers and peasants and, therefore, firm and unshakable. We call upon them to elect to the

councils of the church congregations worthy people, honest and faithful to the Orthodox church, not involved in petty politics, and sincerely friendly to the Soviet power. The activities of the Orthodox congregations must be conducted not for petty politics, which is absolutely foreign to God's church, but for strengthening the Orthodox faith; for the enemies of holy orthodoxy—the sectarians, Catholics, Protestants, atheists, and their like—are striving to utilize every moment in the life of the Orthodox church for its harm. The enemies of the church resort to every kind of false act, pressure, and even graft in striving to achieve their aims. It is sufficient to see what is going on in Poland where out of 350 churches and monasteries only fifty remain. The rest have either been closed or transformed into Catholic churches.

Today we, having by the grace of God recuperated from our illness and assuming again our services for the church of God, call upon you, beloved brethren, archpastors and pastors, to condemn all opposition to the government, all sinister plottings, uprisings, and all kinds of hostility against it; to share our labors for the pacification of our flock and the building up of God's church.

Conscious of our duty to preserve the purity of the church

which is first of all concerned with the salvation of the people and the accomplishment of the eternal divine principles, we must condemn those who, forgetting the divine and misusing their position in the church, are indulging in coarse, petty politics, sometimes even of a criminal character. Therefore, we give our benediction to the work of a special commission attached to us which shall investigate and try, and wherever necessary, dismiss those

archpastors and pastors who persist in their errors and refuse to repent their opposition to the Soviet power.

At the same time we must note with deep sorrow that some of the sons of Russia, even archpastors and pastors, have left their country for various reasons and engaged abroad in activities which are inconsistent with their vocation and which are harmful to our church. Using our name and our church authority they create there a harmful and counter-revolutionary activity. We firmly declare: We have no connection with them, they are foreign to us, and we condemn their harmful activity. They are free to act according to their convictions; but not to act in our name and in the name of our holy church, under the cloak of working for the good of the church. No good was brought the church by the so-called Karlovitz convention, condemnation of which we hereby again confirm, and we consider it necessary to declare firmly and definitely that all attempts of this kind in the future will elicit on our part the extreme measures, including the prohibition of church service and the bringing of all concerned to trial. With this warning we call upon the archpastors and pastors abroad to cease their political activities in league with the enemies of our people, to have the courage to return to their country, and to speak the truth of themselves and God's church.

Their activities must be investigated. They must be made to answer before the tribunal of the Orthodox church. We hereby appoint a special committee to investigate the activities of archpastors and pastors who fled abroad, particularly the Metropolitans Antoni, formerly of Kiev; Platon, formerly of Odessa, and also of the others, and to judge their activities. Their refusal to obey our orders will force us to try them.

Our enemies, in striving to separate us from our beloved children intrusted by God to us the pastors, are spreading false

Патриарх Тихон

7 Apr 1925

Митрополит Антоний

Signature of Patriarch Tikhon attached to his statement.

rumors to the effect that we are not free to speak according to our beliefs and our conscience, that we are suppressed by the alleged enemies of the people, and are deprived of the possibility to communicate with the flock which is led by us. We declare as false all the inventions about our lack of freedom, since there is no power on earth which could bind our divine conscience and our patriarchal word. Without fear and with great hope for the future path of our holy orthodoxy we humbly ask you, our beloved children, to protect the cause of God, and the sons of lawlessness shall not succeed.

In calling God's benediction upon the archpastors, pastors, and our faithful children, we pray you with peaceful conscience and without fear of committing a sin against our holy faith, to submit to the Soviet power not alone from fear but from conviction, remembering the words of the Apostle: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." (Rom. 13, 1.)

At the same time we express our firm conviction that the establishment of pure, sincere relations will cause our authorities to have full confidence in us, will give us the opportunity to offer religious instruction to the children of our flock, to maintain theological schools for the instruction of pastors, and to publish books and magazines in defense of the Orthodox faith.

Let the Lord strengthen all of us in our faithfulness to the Orthodox faith, the church, and its hierarchy.

[Signed] PATRIARCH TIKHON

Moscow, Donskoy Monastery, April 7, 1925

Insuring Old Age in England

THE problem of the care of dependents of one kind or another grows more acute. Slowly the state and industry are assuming their share of the responsibility for the insecurity of labor. The present Government of Great Britain has proposed an extension of England's social insurance to include widows and orphans and to commence the payment of old-age pensions at the age of 65 instead of 70. It is estimated that approximately twenty million pounds will be added to industry's insurance bill, which already stands at the high figure of £52,000,000. Most of the important countries of Europe have preceded England in the development of social insurance schemes; by 1920 compulsory widows' and orphans' insurance had been adopted in France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Austria, and Czecho-Slovakia. With regard to old-age pensions Germany took the lead in 1889 and by 1920 Luxemburg, France, Rumania, Sweden, Holland, Austria, Spain, Italy, Portugal, and Czecho-Slovakia had enacted laws. Voluntary old-age insurance existed in Belgium and England; in America in the States of Massachusetts and Wisconsin, and in Canada.

The United States has been backward in all forms of social insurance. Workmen's compensation has been the one most widely adopted; forty-two States now have such laws. The passing of widows' pension laws began in 1911 and spread to thirty-nine States by 1919; today forty-three States make provision of some kind. Practically nothing has been done in the way of old-age pensions. A federal provision for pensioning government employees was finally passed in 1920 after years of agitation. Many organizations, several railroads, and other private undertakings make provision for their own employees, but only a small fraction of the working population is provided for in this way.

Great Britain's measure has passed its second reading and will undoubtedly become a law shortly. Parts of the bill are reprinted below from the *London Times* of May 6.

1. OBJECTS AND SCOPE OF THE SCHEME

The object of the bill is to extend the social services provided for the working population by adding to the existing schemes of health insurance, unemployment insurance, and workmen's compensation a scheme of:

(a) Pensions for widows and dependent children, and

(b) Old-age pensions commencing at the age of 65 instead of 70 and passing, on the attainment of the age of 70, into pensions under the Old Age Pensions Acts, freed from the restrictions and disqualifications at present applied to such pensions.

The bill, which extends to Great Britain, establishes the new scheme on a contributory and compulsory basis, interlocked with the present scheme of health insurance. The beneficiaries are the survivors of members of the working population insured under that scheme in Great Britain, who now number approximately 15,000,000 persons. An option (similar to that provided under health insurance) is given to a person who hereafter ceases to be compulsorily insurable on leaving employment, or who has already ceased to be insured before the inception of the new scheme, to continue in or to resume insurance as a voluntary contributor at the full rate of contribution ordinarily payable by employer and employee jointly. Thus all members of the community who at some time in their lives pass through a substantial period of insurable employment (not less than two years) will have an opportunity of taking advantage of the scheme. The voluntary contributor, like the employed contributor, must be insured both for health insurance and for pensions.

Persons who by reason of means have obtained certificates exempting them from the liability to be insured for health insurance will continue to be exempt from health insurance, but men so exempted will be insured for widows' and orphans' pension. Certain other classes of persons (persons in excepted employment, such as school-teachers, employees of local authorities, the salaried staffs of railway companies and others), who are outside health insurance on the ground that they are engaged in employment the terms of which secure to them benefits equivalent on the whole to the health-insurance benefits, will continue to be excepted from health insurance, but will, if the rate of their remuneration does not exceed £250 a year, be required to be insured for widows', orphans', and old-age pensions, except so far as it is proved that the terms of their employment provide for them and their dependents benefits corresponding to the pensions provided.

Special provision is made for widows and children of insured men who, having died before the inception of the scheme, cannot contribute under it, and also for insured persons who have attained the age of 70 or who attain that age before the date on which old-age pensions begin to be payable under the scheme.

2. BENEFITS

The bill provides that pensions shall be payable to the following classes of persons at the following rates:

(a) *Widows' Pensions.*—10s. a week for the widow of an insured man who dies after the date of the commencement of the scheme and was under 70 years of age at that date, with an additional allowance for children up to the age of 14, at the rates of 5s. a week for the eldest child and 3s. a week for each of the other children. The pension to the widow is payable until she attains the age of 70 or remarries. Her remarriage will not affect the children's allowance, which will continue to be payable on the terms stated above. If the widow dies leaving a child or children under the age of 14, such children will, until they reach the age of 14, receive an orphan's pension at the rates shown in (b) below.

In all cases where there is more than one child, the eldest under 14 succeeds to the 5s. allowance.

If the widow is over 70 at the death of her husband and is not already in receipt of an old-age pension, the bill provides

that she shall on his death become entitled to an old-age pension under the Old Age Pensions Acts, 1908 to 1924, without the application of the tests as to means, residence, and nationality required by those acts.

(b) *Orphans' Pensions*.—7s. 6d. a week for the eldest child, and 6s. a week for each of the younger children (up to the age of 14 in each case), of an insured man, being a married man or a widower, or of an insured widow.

(c) *Old Age Pensions*.—10s. a week to insured men and insured women between the ages of 65 and 70, and 10s. a week to the wives between the ages of 65 and 70 of insured men who are themselves entitled to pensions. If the wife is over 70 when her husband becomes entitled to an old-age pension under the scheme it is provided that she shall receive an old-age pension under the Old Age Pensions Acts, 1908 to 1924, without the application of the means, residence, and nationality tests.

In order to safeguard the scheme against abuse the bill provides that on the death of a man who, having married after the introduction of the bill, was over the age of 60 at the date of his marriage, his widow will only be entitled to a widow's pension if (1) five years have elapsed at the death of the husband since the date of the marriage, or (2) if there are children of the marriage, or (3) if at the date of the marriage she was entitled to a widow's pension in respect of the insurance of a former husband.

The wife of a man who, having married after the introduction of the bill, was over the age of 60 at the date of his marriage will only become entitled to an old-age pension in respect of her husband's insurance on attaining 65 if five years have elapsed since the date of the marriage; if five years have not elapsed her right to pension is postponed until the expiration of the five years. If, however, she was in receipt of a widow's pension at the date of the marriage her right to an old-age pension will not be postponed but she will be entitled as soon as she reaches the age of 65. In all cases the husband must have become entitled to an old-age pension before the wife can acquire a title in respect of his insurance.

Every person in receipt of a widow's pension or an old-age pension under the scheme will on attaining the age of 70 be entitled to an old-age pension under the Old Age Pensions Acts, 1908 to 1924, without the application of the tests required by those acts as to means, residence, and nationality.

A widow who is in receipt of a widow's pension under the scheme will be automatically exempt from the liability to be insured under the Health Insurance and Unemployment Insurance Acts.

5. DATES OF COMMENCEMENT OF SCHEME

1. The provisions as to pensions to widows and orphans will commence from January 4, 1926.

2. The provisions as to unrestricted old-age pensions awarded to or in respect of persons over 70 on July 2, 1926, or who attain the age of 70 between July 2, 1926, and January 2, 1928, will commence from July 2, 1926.

3. The provisions as to other old-age pensions will commence from January 2, 1928.

The principle is that adopted in the National Health Insurance Acts, viz., that benefits should not accrue until a substantial number of contributions have been paid. The waiting period for disablement benefit under those acts is two years, and this is adopted for the normal case of the old-age pensioner (3) above.

No contributions can, however, be paid in respect of existing widows and orphans or persons over 70, because in the first case the husband or father is dead and in the second case the person by virtue of whose insurance the claim arises will have ceased contributions at age 70 under the working of the National Health Insurance scheme with which this scheme is interlocked. The principle therefore cannot be applied in these cases, and the dates selected for commencement

**What Do You Expect of College?
College Women and Marriage.
Family Influence in College Life.
The College Polishes—What?**

*These are a few of the
Chapter Headings in—*

COLLEGE

By

JOHN PALMER GAVIT

Author of "Americans by Choice"

"This is not a technical study by an expert in education; nor a muck-raking by a reformer; nor a criticism by a person with theories to substantiate. I have tried to see the human side of this business."—*From Mr. Gavit's introduction.* Just ready, \$2.00

Harcourt, Brace and Company

383 Madison Ave.

New York

For Student-Workers

The Nation offers three prizes to college and university students who work in mines, factories or fields this summer and write their experiences for publication.

The contest is open to graduate and undergraduate students who are now enrolled in college or university. First prize, \$125. Second prize, \$75. Third prize, \$25.

For a statement of the conditions write to

Student Worker Contest,

**The Nation,
20 Vesey Street, New York**

of benefits in (1) and (2) are simply the earliest dates by which the administrative arrangements can be ready. The post-act widow and orphan cannot be placed in a worse position than the existing widow and orphan, and are therefore also brought in from January, 1926.

6. CONTRIBUTIONS

(a) *Rates of Contribution.* The ordinary rates of contribution, commencing from January 4, 1926, will be 9d. for a man (of which 4½d. will be payable by the employer and 4½d. by the employee) and 4½d. for a woman (of which 2½d. will be payable by the employer and 2d. by the employee). It should, however, be noted that, as a result of the reduction of the health-insurance age from 70 to 65, the health-insurance contribution is being reduced by 1d. a week in the case of men and ½d. a week in the case of women, so that the net increase consequent on the scheme in the weekly contributions payable in respect of employed persons is 8d. for a man and 4d. for a woman, divided equally between employer and employee.

Lower rates of contribution are applicable to exempt persons and, in certain circumstances, to excepted persons.

Contributions are payable in respect of every employed person under the age of 70 until January 2, 1928, but as from that date contributions by an employed person cease to be payable on his attaining the age of 65, and his right to sickness and disablement benefits, but not to medical benefit, under the health-insurance scheme, as well as to unemployment benefit, ceases at that age. Although contributions will cease on that date to be payable by the employed person, his employer will, nevertheless, be required to pay a contribution which is equivalent in amount to his share of the combined contribution for health insurance and pensions, in respect of every person employed by him who is of the age of 65 or upward. In addition the employer must pay his share of the unemployment-insurance contributions. The object of this provision is to remove any temptation which might otherwise exist to give a preference for employment to men who are over the age of 65.

In addition to the contributions above mentioned there will be an Exchequer contribution at the rate of £4,000,000 a year for ten years, beginning in respect of the financial year 1926-1927, and thereafter at such rate as Parliament may determine.

It is provided that the Government Actuary shall report on the financial position of the scheme in the year 1935 and in every succeeding tenth year. It is further provided in the same clause that, unless Parliament otherwise determines, the ordinary rates of contributions shall, during the decennial period from January 1, 1936, be increased by twopence in respect of men and one penny in respect of women, divided equally between employer and employee, and that similar additional increases are to be made in the decennial periods from January 1, 1946, and 1956.

(b) *Collection of Contributions.* The contributions in respect of an insured person under the scheme and under the National Health Insurance Act will be payable as one contribution and all the arrangements under the latter act for the payment and collection of contributions will apply automatically to the contributions under the scheme. The scheme will not impose any additional work on the employer in regard to the stamping of cards since he will merely be required to affix to the employee's health-insurance card a stamp representing the combined health and pensions contributions for each week for which a contribution is payable under the health-insurance scheme. There will be no change in the arrangements for the surrender of contribution cards; the stamped cards of members of approved societies will be surrendered through the societies, and deposit contributors and exempt persons will surrender their cards to the Insurance Department of the Ministry of Health.

Contributors to This Issue

BERTRAND RUSSELL is an English physicist and social philosopher, author of "Principles of Mathematics," "Proposed Roads to Freedom," "The A B C of Atoms," etc. ROBERT HAMMOND MURRAY is an American living in Mexico City.

HERBERT ADOLPHUS MILLER is professor of sociology at Ohio State University.

LOUIS FISCHER is *The Nation's* Russian correspondent.

CLEMENT WOOD's latest book is "Poets of America."

LANE COOPER is professor of English at Cornell University.

KIRBY PAGE, author of "War; Its Causes, Consequences and Cure," is connected with the International Y. M. C. A.

MARY ROSS is associate editor of the *Survey*.

MALCOLM WILLEY is instructor in sociology at Dartmouth.

FREDERICK BAUSMAN is a former judge in Seattle and the author of "Let France Explain."

HENRIETTA STRAUS is in Sweden working on a new book.

Look at

Your Summer Problems
Schools and Camps
Help Wanted
Positions Wanted

and other interesting advertisements on
the classified page.

BLASCO IBANEZ'

new book

The Old Woman
of the Movies

and other stories

is a revelation of the great Spaniard's wide knowledge of men and lands, and of his artist's gift for selecting from the colorful threads of life and weaving a vital picture. Better than any single novel it shows the scope and quality of his genius. \$2.50

E. P. Dutton & Co., Publishers, 681 Fifth Ave., N. Y.

A TIP FOR ADULT CAMPS

Not every adult camp is going to enroll *Nation* readers by advertising in *The Nation*; but if it offers the sort of vacation *Nation* readers want, a classified advertisement in *The Nation* will give better results than any other kind of advertising anywhere. Past experience has proven that. If you think yours is the camp *Nation* readers would be interested in, write for rates to Dept. C. C., care of *The Nation*.

accept
nothing but

Non Depressant
non Habit Forming
In Convenient
Aluminum Boxes
At every drug store

3 Tablets 15c.
10 Tablets 40c

Midol
for HEADACHE

GENERAL DRUG CO., - 94 N. Moore Street, New York

When writing to advertisers, please mention The Nation